

EXHIBIT 16

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 1	Page 3
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA	INDEX
In Re: Bair Hugger Forced Air Warming Products Liability Litigation	EXHIBITS DESCRIPTION PAGE MARKED
This Document Relates To: All Actions MDL No. 15-2666 (JNE/FLM)	Ex 226 Excel spreadsheet of data, 3MBH0049711-3 39
DEPOSITION OF DR. DANIEL SESSLER VOLUME I, PAGES 1 - 152 JANUARY 11, 2017	227 E-mail string, 3MBH0024866 95
(The following is the deposition of DR. DANIEL SESSLER, taken pursuant to Notice of Taking Deposition, via videotape, at the Cleveland Clinic, P Building, Conference Room P77-013, 2070 East 90th Street, Cleveland, Ohio, commencing at approximately 10:11 o'clock a.m., January 11, 2017.)	228 E-mail string, 3MBH01054232-4 121
	229 E-mail with attachment, 3MBH01621689-95 123
	230 E-mail, 3MBH01486024 125
	231 E-mail string, 3MBH01534469-71 131
	232 E-mail string, 3M00585482-3 143
	233 E-mail, 3MBH00518536 145
	234 Sessler deposition transcript dated November 20, 2015 150
	235 Sessler deposition transcript dated July 9, 2015 150
	236 Sessler deposition transcript dated May 27, 2015 150
	19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
Page 2	Page 4
1 APPEARANCES: 2 On Behalf of the Plaintiffs: 3 Jan M. Conlin 4 CIRESI CONLIN L.L.P. 5 225 South 6th Street, Suite 4600 6 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 7 8 Gabriel Assaad 9 KENNEDY HODGES 10 4409 Montrose Boulevard, Suite 200 11 Houston, Texas 77006 12 On Behalf of Defendants: 13 Corey L. Gordon and Peter J. Goss 14 BLACKWELL BURKE P.A. 15 432 South Seventh Street, Suite 2500 16 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415 17 18 On Behalf of the Deponent: 19 Sandra M. DiFranco 20 Cleveland Clinic Law Department 21 2070 East 90th Street 22 Cleveland, Ohio 44195 23 24 25	1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (Witness sworn.) 3 DR. DANIEL SESSLER 4 called as a witness, being first duly sworn, 5 was examined and testified as follows: 6 ADVERSE EXAMINATION 7 BY MS. CONLIN: 8 Q. Good morning, Dr. Sessler. We've not met 9 before; correct? 10 A. Correct. 11 Q. Okay. I represent plaintiffs in an action 12 that's been brought against 3M involving the Bair 13 Hugger device. Do you understand that? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Okay. And you, in fact, were deposed a 16 number of times in connection with this Bair Hugger 17 device in connection with the Walton and Johnson Texas 18 litigations; correct? 19 A. I was deposed a number of times. I am not 20 sure what it was about. 21 Q. Okay. But you did -- 22 You were deposed three times as it relates 23 to your work and advice regarding the Bair Hugger 24 device; correct? 25 A. Correct.

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 5	Page 7
<p>1 Q. Okay. And do you stand by that testimony 2 today?</p> <p>3 A. I do.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And it was truthful and accurate at 5 the time you gave it?</p> <p>6 A. It was.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And to the best of your knowledge 8 it's truthful and accurate today; correct, doctor?</p> <p>9 A. Correct.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Now you are an anesthesiologist; 11 correct?</p> <p>12 A. I am.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And can you describe your position 14 here at the Cleveland Clinic.</p> <p>15 A. I'm a Michael Cudahey Professor and Chair of 16 the Department of Outcomes Research.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And what is the Department of 18 Outcomes Research?</p> <p>19 A. It's part of the Anesthesia Institute, and 20 we coordinate clinical research.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And you do a number of clinical 22 trials; correct?</p> <p>23 A. We do.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Now you've also -- you're a -- 25 You're a consultant at 3M; correct?</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. You're aware that 3M is the exclusive 2 distributor for VitaHEAT now; correct?</p> <p>3 A. I heard that, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. What kind of consulting work do you 5 do for them?</p> <p>6 A. I'm on their advisory board.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And do you meet regularly?</p> <p>8 A. We've never met.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Who told you that 3M was going to be 10 the exclusive distributor of the VitaHEAT product?</p> <p>11 A. Someone from VitaHEAT.</p> <p>12 Q. Who was that person?</p> <p>13 A. I don't remember.</p> <p>14 Q. Were you involved at all in discussions with 15 3M as to become the -- strike that. Let me start over 16 again.</p> <p>17 Did you have any discussions with 3M 18 regarding whether they should or should not become an 19 exclusive distributor for VitaHEAT?</p> <p>20 A. None whatsoever.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Have you ever talked with 3M about 22 VitaHEAT?</p> <p>23 A. Never.</p> <p>24 Q. Have you ever talked with 3M about Mistral?</p> <p>25 A. Never.</p>
<p>1 A. I am.</p> <p>2 Q. And that was on an exclusive basis; is that 3 right, doctor?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Can you describe the other companies 6 for whom you consult.</p> <p>7 A. There are roughly 10 of them.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. And can you list them, please.</p> <p>9 A. Not all of them, but --</p> <p>10 Q. Okay.</p> <p>11 A. -- I can mention some of them.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Go ahead.</p> <p>13 A. 3M, 37Company, CareFusion, VitaHEAT, Mercury 14 Medical. And there are others, --</p> <p>15 Q. Okay.</p> <p>16 A. -- but I don't remember them offhand.</p> <p>17 Q. And 37Company produces a product called the 18 Mistral; is that right?</p> <p>19 A. Correct.</p> <p>20 Q. And do you do consulting for them today with 21 respect to the Mistral?</p> <p>22 A. I have not --</p> <p>23 I serve on their advisory board, so once a 24 year, or less often, we meet. And -- and they pay for 25 my travel expenses, they don't actually give me cash.</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. You understand how the Mistral 2 product works as a result of your consulting work for 3 them; correct?</p> <p>4 A. It's a generic forced-air cover.</p> <p>5 Q. Well, do you have any understanding, for 6 example, of the filtration differences between the 7 Mistral device and the Bair Hugger device?</p> <p>8 A. No.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Do you know whether the Mistral 10 utilizes a HEPA filter?</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you know whether the Bair Hugger utilizes 13 a HEPA filter?</p> <p>14 A. I believe it does.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And what's that based on?</p> <p>16 A. I have no idea.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. During the time -- now you -- 18 Prior to the time that 3M bought Arizant, 19 you were also consulting for Arizant as it relates to 20 the Bair Hugger; correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And that work goes back 'til at least 23 2006; am I right?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you recall when you first started</p>

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

<p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p> <p>1 consulting with Arizant regarding the Bair Hugger? 2 A. No. 3 Q. Okay. During the course of your consulting 4 work for either Arizant or 3M regarding the Bair 5 Hugger, have you ever had discussions with them 6 regarding the filtration efficiencies of the Bair 7 Hugger? 8 A. No. 9 Q. Do you know whether there's been any changes 10 to the filter utilized in the Bair Hugger -- 11 A. No. 12 Q. -- over the years? 13 Do you know whether that filtration 14 efficiency of the Bair Hugger has been diminished 15 through changes in filters over the years? 16 A. No. 17 Q. Okay. Now you also have a specialty in 18 epidemiology; is that right? 19 A. I -- I'm not a specialist in epidemiology. 20 Q. Is it one of your specialties? 21 A. I've never taken a course in epidemiology. 22 Q. Oh, okay. And it's not a trick question, 23 Dr. Sessler. The reason why I'm asking is because on 24 your LinkedIn site it says your specialties are 25 clinical research, anesthesia, thermal regulation and</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p> <p>1 Q. Are you aware -- 2 So have you been aware at all of the CDC's 3 investigation of a device -- warming/cooling device 4 manufactured by Sonnenschein that has been claimed to 5 have created infection risks in cardiac patients? 6 A. I'm sorry, I didn't catch the name of the 7 device. 8 Q. Sonnenschein. 9 A. Never heard of it. 10 Q. Okay. Are you -- 11 Notwithstanding the name, are you aware that 12 the CDC is conducting an investigation regarding the 13 mycobacterium chimaera outbreak that resulted from 14 aero -- aerosol -- aerosolized particles in the 15 exhaust of the warming/cooling units during cardiac 16 surgery? 17 A. No. 18 Q. Do you have -- 19 You are an expert in normothermia though; 20 correct, doctor? 21 A. Again, I don't have a degree in it, I've 22 never studied it, but it's been an interest of mine. 23 Q. Okay. And a lot of the papers that you've 24 published have -- have talked about the need for 25 maintaining normothermia during surgeries; correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p> <p>1 epidemiology. 2 A. Many -- many of our studies include an 3 epidemiologic aspect. Epidemiology would claim that 4 it includes clinical research, that all clinical 5 research is a type of epidemiology, and I was the 6 course director for epidemiology for the medical 7 school here for five years. But I've never taken a 8 course in it, I don't have a degree in it, I'm -- I'm 9 not really an expert in epidemiology. 10 Q. You don't have a -- a -- an expertise, then, 11 in how bacteria can be aerosolized or moved in the 12 environment? 13 A. Absolutely not. 14 Q. Okay. Now you've spent time with Michelle 15 Hulse Stevens at 3M; is that right, doctor? 16 A. I -- I know Michelle, yes. 17 Q. And you've worked with her; correct? 18 A. Correct. 19 Q. And have you talked with her at all about 20 the litigation that's going on involving the Bair 21 Hugger? 22 A. No. 23 Q. Okay. Have you talked to her about the 24 issues surrounding the warming/cooling devices? 25 A. I don't even know what you're referring to.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p> <p>1 A. Correct. 2 Q. Okay. Now do you know -- 3 With respect to Michelle Hulse Stevens, can 4 you describe what your advisory role is to 3M today as 5 it relates to warming devices? 6 A. I guess I'm theoretically on an advisory 7 board, but the board has not met for several years at 8 least. 9 Q. When is the last time you saw Dr. Hulse 10 Stevens? 11 A. I don't remember. 12 Q. Would it have been in the last couple of 13 years? 14 A. Oh, yes. 15 Q. Okay. And you also know Gary Hansen; 16 correct? 17 A. I do. 18 Q. You worked with him when he was part of 19 Arizant and you've worked with him now that he's part 20 of 3M; correct? 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. Have you talked with Gary Hansen about this 23 litigation? 24 A. No. 25 Q. Have you talked with Gary Hansen about 3M's</p>

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 interest in acquiring an exclusive distribution 2 license for VitaHEAT?</p> <p>3 A. No.</p> <p>4 Q. Would you expect Gary Hansen to be truthful 5 and honest with you as it relates to your advisory 6 work on warming devices for 3M?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And do you know an Al Van Duren?</p> <p>9 A. I do.</p> <p>10 Q. And how long have you known Mr. Van Duren?</p> <p>11 A. Probably two decades.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And when did you first start working 13 or getting to know Mr. Van Duren?</p> <p>14 A. Al Van Duren was an early employee of 15 Augustine Medical, and I started working with the 16 company, I think, shortly after it was founded.</p> <p>17 Q. And in fact, you were aware as early as the 18 '90s that a study that you had conducted involving 19 normothermia in colorectal surgeries was being used as 20 a basis for saying that Bair Hugger forced-air warming 21 would be appropriate to keep patients warm in surgery; 22 correct?</p> <p>23 A. Which dates?</p> <p>24 Q. Well the -- I believe that study was in 25 1996. Right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 agreement with 3M; correct?</p> <p>2 A. I do.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And is it fair to state, doctor, that 4 3M has funded studies that -- on Bair Hugger that 5 you've been a part of?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And they've used that work to promote 8 Bair Hugger; correct?</p> <p>9 A. I assume, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And again, that's been with your 11 approval; correct?</p> <p>12 A. They don't need my approval and they don't 13 ask for my approval. And any company can use any 14 published study in -- in any marketing material.</p> <p>15 Q. Let me ask it a different way. You've never 16 contacted them and said, "I don't want you using my 17 study on Bair Hugger to promote the device;" correct?</p> <p>18 A. I've never contacted any company in a 19 similar situation.</p> <p>20 Q. And my question is more specific, relates to 21 3M. You've never contacted 3M and complained about 22 their use of your study on Bair Hugger in connection 23 with promoting the device; correct?</p> <p>24 A. I've never contacted any company.</p> <p>25 Q. And 3M included; correct, doctor?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 A. Correct.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay.</p> <p>3 A. This is Andrea Kurz's New England Journal 4 paper.</p> <p>5 Q. Correct.</p> <p>6 A. Yes, 1996.</p> <p>7 Q. And -- and with your blessing, you've 8 understood that that's been one of the papers that has 9 been utilized to tout the use of Bair Hugger warming 10 during surgery; correct?</p> <p>11 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 12 question.</p> <p>13 MS. DIFRANCO: Go ahead.</p> <p>14 A. Not with my blessing. They just use it.</p> <p>15 Q. Well you're -- you --</p> <p>16 A. Lots of -- lots of companies use it.</p> <p>17 Q. Yeah. But you've been aware that they've 18 used it in promotional literature; correct?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And would you expect Mr. Van Duren to be 21 candid and honest with you as it relates to the work 22 that -- in consulting work you've done for them on the 23 Bair Hugger device?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, I would.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Now you have a confidentiality</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 A. Correct.</p> <p>2 Q. And you understand that 3M has promoted the 3 Bair Hugger for use in all types of surgeries; 4 correct?</p> <p>5 A. I can't really comment on their marketing.</p> <p>6 It's not something I follow.</p> <p>7 Q. Well you've said that the Bair Hugger is -- 8 is safe for use in all surgeries; correct, doctor?</p> <p>9 A. I believe that.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Including orthopedic implant 11 surgeries; correct?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. I'm going to hand you what's been marked, 14 Dr. Sessler, previously as Exhibit No. 17, which is an 15 excerpt out of a CDC proceeding that took place in 16 November of 2015, and I'd like to direct your 17 attention to page 27 of this and give you a moment to 18 read the last paragraph on this page and see if that 19 refreshes your recollection on issues surrounding the 20 warming/cooling units being used during cardiac 21 surgeries.</p> <p>22 Does that refresh any recollection of issues 23 going on regarding the warming/cooling units?</p> <p>24 A. None whatsoever.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay.</p>

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 A. I have no idea what this is about.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Have you kept up on whether the CDC 3 is of the viewpoint that things that blow air in 4 operating rooms shouldn't be used?</p> <p>5 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 6 question.</p> <p>7 A. No.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Would that be something that would be 9 important to you to know in connection with your 10 promotion of the use of the Bair Hugger device?</p> <p>11 MR. GORDON: Same objection.</p> <p>12 A. I'm not sure how to answer that question.</p> <p>13 Q. Why?</p> <p>14 A. What was the question?</p> <p>15 Q. Question is: The fact that the CDC is 16 suggesting that nothing that blows air should be 17 present in an operating room, is that something that 18 you think would be important to know --</p> <p>19 MR. GORDON: Object to the --</p> <p>20 Q. -- in connection with your promotion and 21 suggestion that the Bair Hugger device is appropriate 22 for use in surgeries?</p> <p>23 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 24 question.</p> <p>25 A. I'd be more interested in the data on which</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19</p> <p>1 question, also lack of foundation.</p> <p>2 A. I don't think I'm qualified to answer a 3 question about what manufacturers should do.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. If you were a science advisor for 3M 5 and were aware of this, would you think that this 6 would be something that you would want them to 7 investigate in order for you to thoroughly undertake 8 your role as a science advisor to a company?</p> <p>9 MR. GORDON: Same objections.</p> <p>10 A. I have not been advising them on this issue.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. But you are advising them on 12 forced-air warming.</p> <p>13 A. I am.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. In connection with advising them on 15 forced-air warming, do you think the fact that the CDC 16 is suggesting that nothing be in an operating room 17 that blows air would be something that you would want 18 to discuss and consult with them on?</p> <p>19 MR. GORDON: Same objections.</p> <p>20 A. Not necessarily.</p> <p>21 I'd like -- I'd like to see what this is 22 based on. This just seems to be free-form opinion as 23 far as I can tell.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. But in any event, you've never been 25 apprised of the warming/cooling units and the CDC's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 18</p> <p>1 their opinions were based.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And you haven't done an investigation 3 on that; right?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. And in fact for years, doctor, you've been 6 suggesting to 3M that they should do a microbial study 7 as it relates to the Bair Hugger; right?</p> <p>8 A. I did suggest a study, yes.</p> <p>9 Q. On multiple occasions; correct?</p> <p>10 A. Possibly. Probably.</p> <p>11 Q. And they've refused to date; correct?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. Have they told you why they've refused?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you know who made the decision at 3M?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you know who made the decision at 18 Arizant?</p> <p>19 A. No.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Do you think the fact that the CDC is 21 recommending that nothing that blows air in an 22 operating theater should be present, if possible, is 23 something that a reasonably prudent manufacturer of a 24 forced-air warming device should take into account?</p> <p>25 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 20</p> <p>1 investigation by anyone at 3M; correct?</p> <p>2 A. This is the first I've heard of it.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Now I'd like to talk with you a 4 little bit, and I -- I don't intend to waste your time 5 here today, doctor, so I'm not going to go back 6 through everything on your prior testimony, that's why 7 I asked you at the beginning, you know, if you're 8 standing by that testimony, but I would like to ask 9 you a few questions about your study.</p> <p>10 (Discussion off the stenographic record.)</p> <p>11 BY MS. CONLIN:</p> <p>12 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been 13 previously marked as (Belani) Deposition Exhibit 16, 14 and this is a published study by you, Dr. Olmstead and 15 Dr. Kuelpmann; is that correct?</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 Q. And this was published in the International 18 Anesthesia --</p> <p>19 A. Analgesia & Anal --</p> <p>20 Anesthesia & Analgesia.</p> <p>21 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>22 -- publication in 2011; correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. And you're the lead author on this; 25 is that right, doctor?</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 21	Page 23
<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And if we could take a look at the 3 bottom of the paragraph on the right-hand side of the 4 page right before the "METHODS" where you say, "We 5 thus tested the hypothesis that laminar flow 6 performing -- performance remains well within rigorous 7 and objective standards during forced-air warming." 8 Do you see that?</p> <p>9 A. I do.</p> <p>10 Q. And then I take it that includes you in the 11 "We?"</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Then you say under "METHODS," "We 14 evaluated the effect of forced-air warming on laminar 15 flow performance under three test conditions," and 16 then you list them there; is that right?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Let me be clear. I did not do the testing 19 for this.</p> <p>20 Q. Well that's what I was going to ask you. 21 Because as I read this article, you talk about "We 22 then quantified tracer particle counts near the site 23 of the putative incision..." and I'm just wondering 24 how you can describe it as "We" if you weren't present 25 for any of the testing.</p>	<p>1 protocol.</p> <p>2 Q. If you had testified previously that 3M 3 created the protocols, would you stand behind that 4 today?</p> <p>5 A. Sure.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And you weren't even aware that the 7 study was proposed or conducted until after the 8 testing had been done; correct?</p> <p>9 A. That's correct.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And you weren't involved in designing 11 the protocols; correct?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. And you don't have an opinion on the design 14 of the study; correct?</p> <p>15 A. The design seems fine.</p> <p>16 Q. If you had testified previously that you 17 don't have any opinion regarding the design of the 18 study, would you stand behind that testimony?</p> <p>19 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 20 question.</p> <p>21 A. Based on my looking now, the design seems 22 fine.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. You were in fact sent simply an Excel 24 spreadsheet with the raw data on it; right?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p>1 A. Oh. That's absolutely conventional in 2 writing a paper that the people have different 3 responsibilities within a study. Sometimes there are 4 hundreds of authors on a paper, literally, and they 5 have different contributions to the study. For 6 instance, you might have a pathologist and his 7 contribution is to read slides and interpret them, and 8 you would still say we as a corporate authorship did 9 something.</p> <p>10 Q. The purpose of this was to evaluate the 11 effect of forced-air warming on the disruption of 12 laminar flow; is that right?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And as you indicated, you weren't 15 there when the testing was done; correct?</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 Q. You --</p> <p>18 3M was in control of this study; correct?</p> <p>19 A. Well I think it was Dr. Kuepplmann.</p> <p>20 Q. Well you understood that 3M had a commercial 21 interest in it; correct?</p> <p>22 A. Of course, uh-huh.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And 3M created the protocols; 24 correct, doctor?</p> <p>25 A. I don't know who did the -- created the</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. And you would agree you're not an 2 expert in laminar flow or particulate counts; correct?</p> <p>3 A. Correct.</p> <p>4 Q. And you're not an expert on how bacteria 5 travel through the air; correct?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. And bacterial issues that might be present 8 in hip and knee implants are outside your area of 9 expertise; correct?</p> <p>10 A. Correct.</p> <p>11 Q. And you would assume that the relative risk 12 for an orthopedic surgery by way of infection would be 13 similar to a colorectal surgery or something else; 14 correct?</p> <p>15 A. Oh, not at all.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So how would you describe the 17 relative risk, as you understand it, of bacterial 18 issues and infections in hip and knee implants?</p> <p>19 A. It's less than a tenth of what it is during 20 colorectal surgery.</p> <p>21 Q. And how do you know that?</p> <p>22 A. The incidence of infection has been 23 published widely.</p> <p>24 Q. My question might have been inartful. Let 25 me ask it a different way.</p>

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 You don't have an understanding of how many 2 CFUs is necessary to create an infection in a hip and 3 knee implant versus, as an example, another type of 4 surgery not involving an implant; correct?</p> <p>5 A. No. No.</p> <p>6 Q. You don't know if it takes one colony 7 forming unit to create an infection in an orthopedic 8 implant; correct?</p> <p>9 A. I'm not an expert in this field. My 10 understanding is it takes a whole lot more than one.</p> <p>11 Q. And I -- I take it that's been your 12 understanding as you've advised companies on the 13 effectiveness and safety of forced-air warming 14 devices.</p> <p>15 A. Host defense is the critical way that 16 bacterial infections are prevented.</p> <p>17 Q. Right. And do you know whether that host 18 defense mechanism is impeded or lessened in connection 19 with an orthopedic implant?</p> <p>20 A. Any implant makes infections not necessarily 21 more likely but more serious and certainly harder to 22 treat.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. But it's your belief as you sit here 24 today, doctor, that -- that you don't need -- or that 25 you could have an infection with an orthopedic implant</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 keeping people warm enhances host defense. 2 Q. Is it fair to state that you haven't studied 3 the issue of whether forced-air warming is safe for 4 use in orthopedic implants?</p> <p>5 A. That depends on what you mean by "safe." We 6 have done studies with forced air in hip and knee 7 surgery, and the patients seemed to do just fine.</p> <p>8 Q. What studies are those, doctor?</p> <p>9 A. Well the first one was probably Schmid in 10 1996, but there have been a number of others since 11 then.</p> <p>12 Q. Well you haven't -- I --</p> <p>13 You're talking about other authors or things 14 that you've read; correct?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. What do you -- what --</p> <p>17 Well then describe the work that you've done 18 on this.</p> <p>19 A. The study I mentioned was a study of blood 20 loss in patients who were warmed or not warmed who 21 were all having hip surgery.</p> <p>22 Q. How does that relate to the relative 23 infection risk of Bair Hugger in an orthopedic 24 surgery?</p> <p>25 A. It doesn't. You asked me if it was safe. I</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 with one CFU.</p> <p>2 A. I didn't say that, and I'm not sure I agree 3 with it.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. I'm saying you don't know; right?</p> <p>5 A. I don't know.</p> <p>6 Q. That isn't something that you've studied 7 and -- and become an expert on; correct?</p> <p>8 A. Correct.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you think that's important to know when 10 you're advising companies on the safety and 11 effectiveness of forced-air warming in all surgeries?</p> <p>12 A. I can only comment about things I know about 13 in -- in all contexts. I'm not an expert in 14 everything. I -- I comment about what I know about.</p> <p>15 Q. Right. But you know that you've been saying 16 that forced-air warming is safe for all surgeries --</p> <p>17 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>18 Q. -- and my question is: If you don't know 19 whether in an orthopedic implant it requires very few 20 CFUs to cause an infection, how you can be saying 21 that?</p> <p>22 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 23 question.</p> <p>24 A. Infections are multifactorial. Probably the 25 single-most-important factor is host defense, and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 said we've studied it and the patients did fine. 2 Q. Have you done any work to ascertain whether 3 a Bair Hugger increases the risk of infection for 4 patients undergoing knee or hip implants?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. In fact, doctor, you are agnostic, so to 7 speak, in terms of how you keep patients warm; right?</p> <p>8 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>9 Q. It can be an electric blanket, it could be a 10 resistive heating. Your view is a patient does better 11 if they're warm; correct?</p> <p>12 A. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. But you're not saying that a patient does 14 better by way of infection risk if a Bair Hugger is 15 used versus another type of warming device; correct?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. And in fact, you don't want patients to get 18 hurt; right?</p> <p>19 A. Of course not.</p> <p>20 Q. And if the --</p> <p>21 If Bair Hugger was killing patients, you'd 22 be the first to state it; right, doctor?</p> <p>23 A. I would.</p> <p>24 Q. Now what is Cleveland Clinic using in 25 surgeries today for warming?</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 29	Page 31
<p>1 A. We use forced-air warming. 2 Q. What type? 3 A. Mistral. 4 Q. And why was the decision made to use the 5 Mistral? 6 A. It was less -- 7 MR. GORDON: Object for lack of foundation. 8 MS. CONLIN: You may answer. 9 A. It was less expensive. 10 Q. Was there a review done as to whether 11 Mistral was safer than the Bair Hugger? 12 A. I have no idea. I'm not involved in supply- 13 chain decisions. 14 Q. Okay. You didn't have any discussions with 15 anybody who was in the supply chain? 16 A. I did not. 17 Q. Okay. So you were just -- 18 You know that at one point in time Cleveland 19 Clinic was using Bair Hugger; right? 20 A. I -- 21 Sure. 22 Q. And now they've switched to Mistral; is that 23 right? 24 A. That's correct. 25 Q. Okay. Do you know whether it's because</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. And then the third was set to high or hot 3 air. 4 A. Correct. 5 Q. Forty-three degrees Celsius; correct? 6 A. Correct. 7 Q. And the people who did the testing basically 8 used two blankets, the Bair Hugger 522 upper body 9 blanket and the 635 underbody blanket; correct? 10 A. Looks like it. 11 Q. Okay. At two hospitals, right, Amersfoort 12 and Utrecht? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Okay. Now did you talk with any of the 15 people that actually did the testing? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Okay. Who did you talk with? 18 A. I talked with Ruediger and -- and Russ. 19 Q. Do you know -- 20 And that's Dr. Olmstead? 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. Do you know if Dr. Olmstead was even present 23 during the testing? 24 A. I don't -- I don't know. 25 Q. Do you know who was present during the</p>
<p>1 Mistral has better filtration than the Bair Hugger? 2 A. I was not involved in the decision-making 3 process, but my understanding is it was purely a cost 4 decision. 5 Q. Okay. And who told you it was purely a cost 6 decision? 7 A. I don't remember. 8 Q. Now I'd like to go to the study, (Belani) 9 Exhibit 16, and talk with you a little bit about it. 10 You evaluated the effect of the Bair Hugger 11 on laminar flow performance under three conditions; 12 correct? 13 A. I -- I'd have to review the study. I 14 haven't looked at this in -- 15 Q. Go ahead. 16 A. -- since the last deposition. 17 Q. Go ahead. 18 A. Yes, we used three conditions. 19 Q. Okay. And the -- it was -- 20 The control was the Bair Hugger off; 21 correct? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. And then it was also -- second condition was 24 the forced air of the Bair Hugger was sent to -- set 25 to ambient air; correct?</p>	<p>1 testing? 2 A. The testing was primarily done by Ruediger. 3 Q. By Dr. Kuep -- 4 How do you say that? 5 A. Kuepmann. 6 Q. Kuepmann? Do you know whether -- 7 Do you know what his involvement was in the 8 testing? 9 A. He did the tests. 10 Q. Do you know whether Gary Hansen did the 11 tests, doctor? 12 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 13 question. 14 A. Gary was there. My understanding is that 15 Dr. Kuepmann did the tests. 16 Q. Okay. And was that based on him telling you 17 that? 18 A. No. 19 Q. What was it based on? 20 A. I said it was an assumption. 21 Q. Now if we take -- 22 If we take a look at the second page of 23 this, on the right-hand side, midway down at the 24 bottom of the first full paragraph on page 1417, which 25 is also Bates number 985629, it says that the standard</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 33	Page 35
<p>1 DIN 1946 was chosen because it is objective and more 2 rigorous than the United States standard. Do you see 3 that?</p> <p>4 A. No. I'm in a different place.</p> <p>5 Q. It's right here.</p> <p>6 A. Okay. Now I'm with you.</p> <p>7 Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Do you --</p> <p>9 Now the DIN 1946 standard governs laminar 10 flow rooms --</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. -- in Europe; correct?</p> <p>13 A. I believe so.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you know whether that D -- DIN standard 15 forbids the use of forced-air warming in laminar flow 16 rooms in the EU?</p> <p>17 A. At the time we wrote this paper, I'm pretty 18 sure it did not.</p> <p>19 Q. And what's that based on?</p> <p>20 A. Well I did look at the standard at one 21 point.</p> <p>22 Q. So at the time you submitted this paper, you 23 thought that the -- that forced-air warming could be 24 used under the DIN standard in the EU; correct?</p> <p>25 A. That was certainly my impression, yes.</p>	<p>1 Q. And how do you know that, doctor?</p> <p>2 A. As far as I know, all forced-air warmers 3 contain relatively good filters.</p> <p>4 Q. And you're making the assumption that the 3M 5 one does as well; correct?</p> <p>6 A. Correct.</p> <p>7 Q. If I told you the filtration efficiency was 8 53 percent, would that surprise you?</p> <p>9 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 10 question.</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. I'm going to hand you, Dr. Sessler, 13 what's been previously marked as Deposition Exhibit 14 66. It's actually a two-page document, so I'd ask you 15 to start on the second page and then read up to the 16 first.</p> <p>17 Have you had a chance to read it?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Were you aware that Arizant and 3M 20 were getting calls from the field from users of the 21 Bair Hugger that were concerned about infectious 22 pathogens that were being found in the machines?</p> <p>23 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 24 question, lack of foundation.</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p> <p>1 Q. Now you also write on the right-hand side of 2 this second page, quote, "The forced air blower was 3 positioned on the floor at the volunteer's left side, 4 near where the anesthesiologist would normally sit 5 during surgery." Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Do you know if these were new machines or 8 used machines?</p> <p>9 A. I don't know.</p> <p>10 Q. That wasn't something that was of interest 11 or import to you?</p> <p>12 A. No. Because as far as I know, age of the 13 machine is not relevant to the question here.</p> <p>14 Q. You don't know whether the machine --</p> <p>15 Well you understand the air intake is at the 16 bottom of the machine, correct, on the floor?</p> <p>17 A. I'll take your word for that.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Have you ever examined the machine?</p> <p>19 A. I've used these machines thousands of times, 20 but I couldn't testify to where the air intake is.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Have you asked 3M or Arizant for any 22 information regarding whether the air intake absorbs 23 bacteria near the floor of the OR?</p> <p>24 A. No, I didn't, because it's filtered in the 25 machine. What comes out is sterile.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. Do you see at the top there where Mr. 2 Van Duren says, "Remove and discard the filter (in the 3 biohazardous waste)?" Do you see that?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Now if the machine that you were using in 6 surgery was contaminated with a microorganism, let's 7 say MRSA, would you want to know whether that filter 8 was going to filter that pathogen properly?</p> <p>9 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 10 question.</p> <p>11 MS. DIFRANCO: Go ahead.</p> <p>12 A. It's a two-part question.</p> <p>13 Q. In what way?</p> <p>14 A. Can -- can we break this apart? If -- if a 15 machine's contaminated and --</p> <p>16 Q. Well all right, that's -- that's a fair 17 correction. Let me back up.</p> <p>18 If a machine was contaminated with MRSA, 19 would that be something as an anesthesiologist you 20 would want to know before you decided to use that 21 machine on a patient?</p> <p>22 A. Sure.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And if --</p> <p>24 And would you also want to know whether the 25 filter was able to prevent MRSA or some other pathogen</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 37	Page 39
<p>1 from moving downstream from the filter into the hose 2 and into the blanket?</p> <p>3 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 4 question.</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Have you ever seen anything where 3M 7 or Arizant have advised publicly that if a machine is 8 con -- found to be contaminated, that the filter 9 should be scrapped and treated as biohazardous waste?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Have you seen any documents or had 12 any discussions with 3M regarding advice they have 13 given to people who have called in, users of the Bair 14 Hugger, that you should not blow the dust out of the 15 machine?</p> <p>16 A. No.</p> <p>17 Q. Would that be something that you'd want to 18 know?</p> <p>19 A. That -- that sounds pretty technical. 20 I'm -- I'm not sure how to interpret that.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. If we look back at your study --</p> <p>22 Well let me ask it a different way. Let me 23 ask you another question on that. Do you know 24 whether, as these machines are used in surgery, after 25 surgery, whether the pathogens build up inside?</p>	<p>1 Q. Well you understand the two log reduction 2 line --</p> <p>3 I mean the DIN standard isn't designed to 4 evaluate Bair Hugger; right? What you were doing was 5 saying you can use the Bair Hugger and still meet the 6 DIN standard; right, doctor?</p> <p>7 A. The question was whether forced-air warming; 8 that is, warm air disturbs laminar flow and makes it 9 substantially less effective than it would be 10 otherwise, so the DIN standard is highly relevant. In 11 any case, whether or not you believe that, there's no 12 important difference here.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And if we look at Figure 2, you've 14 got -- the scale goes from 1, 10, 100 to 1000; right?</p> <p>15 A. It's a log scale.</p> <p>16 Q. And then 10,000; right?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. All right.</p> <p>19 (Exhibit 226 was marked for 20 identification.)</p> <p>21 BY MS. CONLIN:</p> <p>22 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been 23 marked as Exhibit 226, which is the raw data that Gary 24 Hansen produced regarding the study which is reflected 25 in (Belani) Exhibit 16, your paper.</p>
<p>1 A. No.</p> <p>2 Q. And you've just assumed that the filter is 3 going to do its job; right?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Why do you think the Bair Hugger had a HEPA 6 filter?</p> <p>7 A. Presumably, I was told that at some point, 8 but I don't remember how.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Now if we can look under the 10 "RESULTS" section of this study, which is on Bates 11 page 985630, under the "RESULTS" section you say, 12 "With the Arizant 522 upper body cover, background 13 par -- particle Cx were reduced to approximately 5 log 14 by the laminar flow system, and there were no 15 statistically significant or clinically important 16 differences among the 3 blower settings: off, ambient 17 air, and high." Do you see that?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And how did you go about arriving at the 20 conclusion that there was no clinical -- clinically 21 important differences between the three settings?</p> <p>22 A. If you look at Figure 2, the columns for no 23 air, ambient air and warm air are virtually the same 24 height, and they're all way below the two log 25 reduction line.</p>	<p>1 Page 40</p> <p>1 MS. DIFRANCO: Have you a chance to look at 2 it?</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Now this is the data that went into the 5 paper that you authored with Dr. Olmstead and Dr. 6 Kuepemann; correct?</p> <p>7 A. I -- I assume.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. And there were five runs both with 9 the 522 blanket and five runs with the 635 blanket; 10 right?</p> <p>11 A. Looks like it.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And if we take a look at the 635 13 blanket, which is on the right-hand side of Exhibit 14 226, --</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. -- the 625 is the underbody blanket; 17 correct, doctor?</p> <p>18 A. I'll take your word for it.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. If you want to look back at the front 20 of your article, it indicates that it's the underbody 21 blanket, so --</p> <p>22 A. I'll take your word for it.</p> <p>23 Q. All right. So in the last run there were 28 24 particles measured over the -- the hypothetical 25 surgical site with the Bair Hugger off; correct?</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>1 A. Yes. That's the average, right? It -- 2 Q. Well it says at the top "Off." 3 A. No, it's -- it's raw data. Okay. Thank 4 you. 5 Q. Okay? And then with the Bair Hugger at 6 ambient temperature, the particle count over the 7 hypothetical surgical site was 57; correct? 8 A. Right. 9 Q. So that would be a two-times increase; is 10 that right? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Okay. And then if you turn the Bair Hugger 13 on to warm, the particle count over the surgical site 14 is 349 particles; correct? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Okay. So that's about a thousand-percent 17 increase between off and the Bair Hugger on warm; 18 correct? 19 A. Yes. It's about a factor of 10. 20 Q. Okay. About 12 times as many particles; 21 correct, doctor? 22 A. Right. 23 Q. Okay. 24 A. If you look at the -- the other one -- the 25 other run, though, it has much less effect. Also, you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 A. In this run it had a very small effect, in 2 the other run it had no effect. 3 Q. Okay. So how is it that you can say in the 4 title of your paper that forced-air warming does not 5 worsen air quality in laminar flow operating rooms 6 when at least some of the -- well all of the runs 7 showed at least some difference between the Bair 8 Hugger off and the Bair Hugger on? 9 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 10 question. 11 A. The average performance effect with ambient 12 versus warm was 4.8 versus 4.8 in one test, it was 3.2 13 versus 3.5 in another, it was 4.8 versus 4.8 in the 14 third, and it was 4.7 versus 4.6. There -- there's no 15 difference there. 16 Q. Well that -- that's the PE, the protective 17 effect; correct? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. Okay. And the protective effect went down 20 on average. 21 A. It was unchanged. There -- there's no 22 important change here. Those numbers are virtually 23 identical. 24 Q. You don't think that a change in the 25 protective effect from 4.0 to 3.2 makes a difference?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 need to look at the average; it's not fair to pick one 2 run. 3 Q. If -- 4 Well, it's got a p-value of .06, correct, 5 for off? 6 A. Yeah. But that's the average. You're 7 looking at one run. 8 Q. Right. Well you only did five runs; 9 correct? 10 A. Yes. But you have to look at all five of 11 them. 12 Q. Okay. Would you agree with me five runs is 13 a pretty small sample? 14 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 15 question. 16 A. No. 17 Q. Why? 18 A. Because this is a mechanical sort of setup 19 and you should get about the same result each time. 20 Q. Well it has -- 21 Looking at this raw data, the use of the 22 Bair Hugger does have an effect on the particulate 23 count over the hypothetical surgery site; correct? 24 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 25 question.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 2 question. 3 A. No. And I especially don't think a 4 difference from 4.8 to 4.8 or from 4.8 to 4.8 in the 5 other study makes a difference. 6 Q. Why didn't you -- 7 Why did you pool the data from Amersfoort 8 and Utrecht? 9 A. Oh. Why wouldn't I? 10 Q. Did you make that decision? 11 A. Probably. 12 Q. Okay. Do you think that a physician would 13 want to know that, with use of the 635 underbody 14 blanket, the particulate count went up 12-fold with 15 use of the Bair Hugger? 16 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 17 question. 18 MS. DIFRANCO: I'll object. You're asking 19 what other physicians would want to know? 20 Q. Would you want to know? 21 A. That was one run. That's not an accurate 22 characterization of this study result, not even 23 slightly accurate. 24 Q. Well it went up -- 25 If you look at just the 635, the underbody</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 45	Page 47
<p>1 blanket between off and warm, in all five runs the 2 particulate count went up ten-fold; right?</p> <p>3 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 4 question, mischaracterizes the -- the data.</p> <p>5 A. How do you figure?</p> <p>6 Q. Well in the first run with the Bair Hugger 7 off the particulate count was 23; correct? In the 8 first run.</p> <p>9 A. I thought we were comparing ambient to warm.</p> <p>10 Q. Well let's just do it this way. All right?</p> <p>11 So in the first run with the Bair Hugger 12 off, with -- utilizing the 635 underbody blanket, the 13 particulate count was 23; correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And with it on ambient it was 260; 16 correct?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. And on warm it was 118; correct?</p> <p>19 A. I'm sorry, I lost you here.</p> <p>20 Q. I'm right here, doctor.</p> <p>21 A. Oh, okay.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay?</p> <p>23 A. Yeah.</p> <p>24 Q. So in that run in the 635, both in the 25 ambient and the warm, the particulate counts went up</p>	<p>1 right-hand corner of Exhibit 226. All right? And I 2 understand that you want to take averages, but my 3 question is this: If a machine, Bair Hugger machine, 4 was contaminated with MRSA and not properly filtering, 5 would that be of clinical significance or importance 6 to you?</p> <p>7 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 8 question.</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Now do you know -- do you know 11 whether you saw Exhibit 226 as part of putting 12 together your paper?</p> <p>13 A. Oh, for sure I did.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Let me ask you something else, then 15 we can take a quick break.</p> <p>16 Do you think the Mistral is as effective at 17 keeping patients warm as the Bair Hugger?</p> <p>18 A. I have no basis for knowing.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. You have done studies on resistive 20 heating and found those equally effective to the Bair 21 Hugger; correct?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. What did you do to prepare for your 24 deposition today?</p> <p>25 A. Nothing.</p>
<p>1 dramatically with the Bair Hugger on; correct?</p> <p>2 A. Yes. But it was half with warming as with 3 ambient, and the general theory here we're testing is 4 that warm air disturbs the laminar flow column.</p> <p>5 Q. And ambient air doesn't?</p> <p>6 A. That was the theory.</p> <p>7 Q. Whose theory?</p> <p>8 A. I believe Scott Augustine came up with this 9 theory.</p> <p>10 Q. All right. Well if it was --</p> <p>11 Let's take the off and warm then. Off it 12 was 23; correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. And warm, the particulate count went up to 15 118; correct?</p> <p>16 A. In that run, yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And you don't consider that 18 clinically significant; correct, doctor?</p> <p>19 A. Okay. You can't look at one run. You have 20 to look at the averages and you have to look at both 21 tests of the 635. You put them both together, 22 there -- there's very little effect.</p> <p>23 Q. Well I'm -- I'm --</p> <p>24 I'd like to do it this way. Okay? So 25 I'm -- I'm focused on the -- the box at the upper</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. You didn't review any documents?</p> <p>2 A. None.</p> <p>3 Q. Did you talk or meet with any of the lawyers 4 representing 3M?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 MS. CONLIN: Okay. Let's take a short 7 break. We've been going about an hour. I've got a 8 new area. But we'll definitely be able to accede to 9 your schedule today. Okay?</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Jan.</p> <p>11 MS. CONLIN: Yeah.</p> <p>12 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please. (Recess taken.)</p> <p>13 BY MS. CONLIN:</p> <p>14 Q. If we can turn back for a moment to Exhibit 15 226, doctor, and if we take a look at the 635 testing 16 in the right-hand box, the 635 testing at Amersfoort 17 with the p --</p> <p>18 Do you see the p-value box there?</p> <p>19 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>20 THE REPORTER: Your answer?</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. You have to say it out loud.</p> <p>23 A. I said yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Yes. Okay.</p>

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 49	Page 51
<p>1 The p-value for off versus ambient is .06; 2 is that right? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And the p-value for warm versus off is .09? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Okay. So in other words, if the experiment 7 were repeated, there would be an increase in particles 8 with the 635 blanket turned on ambient 94 percent of 9 the time. 10 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 11 question, also lack of foundation. 12 A. No, that's not what a p-value means. 13 Q. Okay. How -- how would you describe that? 14 A. It means that there was a 94-percent chance 15 that -- 16 That six times out of a hundred, the 17 distribution of the data would result from chance. 18 Q. Okay. 19 A. That doesn't tell you about repeatability. 20 Q. Why not? Isn't a p-value, the -- the whole 21 notion of p-value to figure out whether it's by random 22 or predictable? 23 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 24 question. 25 A. Not exactly.</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. Have you had a chance to review it? 2 A. I have -- 3 Q. Okay. 4 A. -- at -- the top part. I actually didn't 5 read the bottom part. 6 Q. Okay. Now why don't you go ahead and read 7 the bottom part, too, so I can ask you some questions 8 about that. 9 A. Okay. 10 Q. Okay. The bottom e-mail is an e-mail from 11 Gary Hansen to you and Russ Olmstead; correct? 12 A. It appears to be. 13 Q. Okay. And it's talking about sort of how 14 you're going to do the analysis of the data; correct? 15 A. It doesn't specifically talk about how to do 16 the analysis, but it's that general topic of 17 interpretation I guess. 18 Q. Well one of the things that Gary Hansen 19 writes to you and Dr. Olmstead is "Concerning 20 statistical treatment of the PE data" -- 21 And that's the protective effect data; 22 correct? 23 A. I -- I'm sorry, I didn't realize there was a 24 back side. 25 Q. Sure. Go ahead and take a moment to read</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. How would you describe the 2 differences in p-value between off and warm for a lay 3 person? 4 A. That there was one chance in 10 that the 5 observed distribution of data resulted from chance. 6 Q. Say that again, doctor. 7 A. There was one chance in 10 that the observed 8 distribution of data resulted by chance. 9 Q. Okay. But wouldn't that be saying that 90 10 percent of the time, then, if you ran this again, you 11 would expect to have an increase of particulate counts 12 as reflected in that box? 13 A. No, -- 14 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 15 question. 16 A. -- that's not what it means. 17 Q. All right. 18 A. It -- it's not even close. 19 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been 20 previously marked as Deposition Exhibit 12, which 21 appears to be some e-mail exchanges between you, Gary 22 Hansen and Russell Olmstead with respect to your 23 paper. You can take a moment if you haven't seen it 24 in a while. 25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p> <p>1 it. 2 A. Okay. 3 Q. All right. Have you had a chance to read 4 it? 5 A. I have. 6 Q. Okay. Now on the second page of what's been 7 previously marked as Exhibit 12, Mr. Hansen talks with 8 you and Russ Olmstead concerning the statistical 9 treatment of the PE data; correct? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. And that's the protective effect data? 12 A. Correct. 13 Q. And he's talking about two possible 14 approaches. The first is to perform a t-test 15 comparison; correct? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. And what is that? 18 A. T-test essentially compares the difference 19 in the means -- 20 Well, the test is a difference in the means 21 divided by the standard deviation, approximately. 22 Q. Okay. And then he writes there, "Note that 23 none of the differences are significant to within 95 24 percent confidence." Do you see that? 25 A. Yes.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 53	Page 55
<p>1 Q. And what did you understand that to be 2 reference to?</p> <p>3 A. Well, doing a bunch of t-tests comparing 4 different average results.</p> <p>5 Q. Well isn't he noting there, Mr. Hansen, that 6 if you use the t-test on the data that was generated 7 in connection with the Amersfoort and Utrecht testing, 8 that none of the differences are significant to within 9 a 95-percent confidence?</p> <p>10 A. That's what the note says, yes.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And then he writes, "It won't escape 12 notice that the number of samples is small;" correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Meaning that there were five runs for five 15 minutes each; correct?</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 MR. GORDON: Object to the form.</p> <p>18 Q. Are you aware of surgeries that take place 19 over five minutes?</p> <p>20 A. That's completely irrelevant.</p> <p>21 Q. My question is: Are you aware of any 22 surgeries that take place over five minutes?</p> <p>23 A. Sure.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. What?</p> <p>25 A. D&C.</p>	<p>1 reason why you'd need to use a Bair Hugger as opposed 2 to one of these resistive blankets; correct?</p> <p>3 A. Resistive blankets can cause burns. And 4 they haven't been used that much. How safe they are 5 in terms of thermal injury remains to be determined.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Setting aside thermal injury and 7 assuming you have a safe blanket, there would be no 8 medical reason to choose a Bair Hugger over a 9 resistive therapy; correct?</p> <p>10 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 11 question.</p> <p>12 A. Well if you stipulate that safety is the 13 same, the efficacy is comparable.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. What if the safety of the Bair Hugger 15 was less because it increased the possibility that 16 bacterial pathogens could enter the surgical site?</p> <p>17 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 18 question.</p> <p>19 A. If -- if forced air causes harm, causes 20 complications, and you stipulate, based on nothing, 21 that some other tech -- technique doesn't, sure. 22 But -- but there's no basis for either of those 23 assumptions.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. And in fact one of the things that 25 you're on record as saying is that the Bair Hugger has</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. Anything else?</p> <p>2 A. Ear tubes.</p> <p>3 Q. I'd say that you're right on that one. I've 4 had -- my kids have had a few.</p> <p>5 You would agree with me that most surgeries 6 are not five minutes or less; correct?</p> <p>7 A. I agree.</p> <p>8 Q. And an orthopedic surgery might take an hour 9 as an example; correct?</p> <p>10 A. Correct.</p> <p>11 Q. Now you've actually also stated that the -- 12 whether forced-air warming is effective or necessary 13 in the first hour of a surgery is sort of an open 14 question; right?</p> <p>15 A. Depends how you define efficacy.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. But you've in fact stated that 17 previously; correct?</p> <p>18 A. Depends how you define efficacy, but yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And you don't have any information to 20 suggest that a Bair Hugger in use for an orthopedic 21 surgery is somehow more effective than, say, a 22 resistive blanket; correct?</p> <p>23 A. We've tested two resistive blankets and they 24 had comparable efficacy.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. There -- there would be no medical</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p> <p>1 been used in lots of surgeries with no evidence of 2 injury or infections; correct?</p> <p>3 A. As far as I know, forced air has not caused 4 thermal injury, used correctly.</p> <p>5 Q. Well I meant --</p> <p>6 My question was a little different.</p> <p>7 A. I'm sorry.</p> <p>8 Q. You're on record as stating you think 9 forced-air warming, Bair Hugger, is safe in surgeries 10 and doesn't increase the risk of infection; correct?</p> <p>11 A. I believe it reduces the risk of infection.</p> <p>12 Q. And in --</p> <p>13 A. Based -- based on available data, that's 14 what you have to conclude.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And in fact, one of the reasons you 16 say that is because you say it's been used in lots of 17 surgeries and there haven't been complaints; correct?</p> <p>18 A. No.</p> <p>19 Q. You haven't said that?</p> <p>20 A. That isn't the reason.</p> <p>21 Q. What isn't the reason, doctor?</p> <p>22 A. I -- I believe you said that I've said 23 that --</p> <p>24 Let -- let's go back to your question 25 because it was a two-part question and you -- you</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 57	Page 59
<p>1 attributed a thought process to me.</p> <p>2 MS. CONLIN: Could we have the question</p> <p>3 back?</p> <p>4 (Record read by the court reporter.)</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. So when you say the Bair Hugger</p> <p>7 reduces the risk of infection, you're talking about</p> <p>8 maintaining normo -- normo -- normothermia in the</p> <p>9 patient; correct?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Well, that's the presumed mechanism, but in</p> <p>12 fact two randomized trials compared forced-air warming</p> <p>13 to no warming and both showed that infection risk was</p> <p>14 reduced. That's the only clinical evidence I'm aware</p> <p>15 of.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And what -- what studies are those?</p> <p>17 A. Kurz and Melling.</p> <p>18 Q. Can you spell the name on the second one?</p> <p>19 A. M-e-l-l-i-n-g-s -</p> <p>20 Q. Okay.</p> <p>21 A. -- I think. I'm not sure about the "s".</p> <p>22 Q. Well Melling was prewarming; correct?</p> <p>23 A. And intraoperative warming I believe.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you know?</p> <p>25 A. I believe there was an intraoperative</p>	<p>1 Q. It's not a forced-air warming device; correct?</p> <p>2 A. Correct.</p> <p>3 Q. Now if we can turn back to Exhibit 12, doctor, you write back to Mr. Hansen on November 16th of 2010; correct?</p> <p>4 A. Apparently.</p> <p>5 Q. And this is prior to the publication of your paper with Dr. Olmstead and Kuepmann; correct?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. And then you write, "Hi Gary,</p> <p>8 "On the statistics/P-value spreadsheet, the</p> <p>9 mean value for the 422 cover (warm) in Utrecht is --</p> <p>10 is wrong -- fortunately!" And you say, "The increase</p> <p>11 with the 635 cover on ambient or warm in Amersfoort</p> <p>12 seems substantial, roughly a factor-of-five-to-ten.</p> <p>13 The only reason it isn't statistically significant is</p> <p>14 that there were only five measurements." Do you see</p> <p>15 that?</p> <p>16 A. I do.</p> <p>17 Q. You would agree with me this was an underpowered study; correct?</p> <p>18 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>19 question.</p> <p>20 A. No.</p>
<p>1 warming group in that study.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay.</p> <p>3 A. But my assertion is largely based on</p> <p>4 Kurz, --</p> <p>5 Q. Okay.</p> <p>6 A. -- which is a better study. It's the --</p> <p>7 The available data shows that randomizing</p> <p>8 patients to forced air reduces infection risk.</p> <p>9 Q. But it's the -- maintaining the normothermia</p> <p>10 that is the hypothesis for why the infection risk is</p> <p>11 reduced; correct?</p> <p>12 A. That's certainly the presumed mechanism.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And as we --</p> <p>14 As you've described, there are other methods</p> <p>15 of maintaining normothermia in a patient besides the</p> <p>16 Bair Hugger; correct?</p> <p>17 A. Correct.</p> <p>18 Q. Mistral is one; correct?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. And VitaHEAT is one; correct?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. How would you describe the VitaHEAT</p> <p>23 technology?</p> <p>24 A. It's an underbody resistive heater with</p> <p>25 pressure relief.</p>	<p>1 Q. Well what did you mean there when you said the reason --</p> <p>2 Well you first acknowledge it's -- the data</p> <p>3 that you and I have been looking at is substantial;</p> <p>4 correct?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And a factor of five to 10; correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And then you say, "The only reason it isn't</p> <p>9 statistically significant is that there were only five</p> <p>10 measurements." What did you mean by that when you</p> <p>11 wrote that to Mr. Hansen and Dr. Olmstead before this</p> <p>12 was published?</p> <p>13 A. If you make enough measurements, very small</p> <p>14 differences will be statistically significant even if</p> <p>15 they're not clinically important. Conversely, you can</p> <p>16 have big differences that are not statistically</p> <p>17 significant and -- and/or important.</p> <p>18 Q. Well why did you write the only reason it</p> <p>19 isn't statistically significant is that there are only</p> <p>20 five measurements?</p> <p>21 A. It just means that if you did enough</p> <p>22 measurements, it would become significant.</p> <p>23 Q. Statistically significant; correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yup.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 61	Page 63
<p>1 Q. Okay. Now in the next paragraph you say, 2 "What clinicians will want to see is basically 3 particle counts under three test circumstances (Off, 4 Ambient, and Warm)." Do you see that? 5 A. Yup. 6 Q. Then you write, "Any substantial increase 7 will still concern them and basically validate Scott's 8 point that forced-air warming increases risk. We can 9 try to convince them that the increase isn't important 10 or that operating rooms still meet DIN standards, but 11 that will be a bit tricky." Do you see that? 12 A. Yup. 13 Q. You knew that physicians would want to see 14 whether, in an individual case such as the 65 -- or 15 635 testing in Amersfoort, that there was a 16 substantial increase in particulates; correct? 17 A. No, that's not what that means. 18 Q. Okay. What -- what -- what were you saying 19 there? 20 A. That first it -- 21 Note the third paragraph where I correct the 22 statistical approach. You need to look at all the 23 data; you can't just pick one piece of data, one line, 24 one run, and say this characterizes the results. 25 Q. Okay.</p>	<p>1 best to consider the hospitals together since that 2 isn't really a factor of interest; and the cover type 3 could be unpaired." Do you see that? 4 A. Uh-huh. Yes. 5 Q. And in fact what you were describing there 6 is rather than show the results from the two hospitals 7 separately, you were going to group them together for 8 the purposes of the paper; right? 9 A. Yes, because it -- that's the way it should 10 have been done. That's -- that's the correct way of 11 handling these data. 12 Q. Why is it the correct way of handling these 13 data? 14 A. Because the two hospitals together 15 characterize the general case better than either 16 hospital alone. 17 Q. Well you know that ORs are different; right? 18 A. Sure. 19 Q. Okay. That can be a confounding factor; 20 right? 21 A. Could be. 22 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 23 question. 24 Q. Could be a confounding factor. 25 Did you do any investigation as to whether</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p> <p>1 A. That's -- that's called data selection; it's 2 a type of research fraud. 3 Q. Would you agree -- 4 A. You have to look at all the data. 5 Q. Would you agree with me that any substantial 6 increase would concern clin -- clinicians? 7 A. Average increase, not -- not results from 8 one run and one circumstance. 9 Q. Would you agree with me that any substantial 10 increase would concern clinicians? 11 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 12 question, also lack of foundation. 13 A. Any substantial increase in average values 14 over all conditions would concern people. 15 Q. Okay. And then you say in the third 16 paragraph, "Possibly the best statistical approach 17 would be an ANOVA with cover type...;" correct? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. And that's in fact what you guys have ended 20 up doing; correct? 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. Okay. And ANOVA is basically analysis of 23 variance; right? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. And then you say, "But perhaps it would be</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p> <p>1 the machine that was used in Amersfoort might have 2 been a used one versus a new one? 3 A. No. 4 Q. Or that there was different protocols for 5 how they clean the OR? 6 A. No. But it's not relevant to this study, 7 which used artificial particles. This had nothing to 8 do with bacteria. 9 Q. Well I think we've already established you 10 don't know whether the Bair Hugger sucks in 11 particulates from off the floor and spews them out 12 into the surgical site; right? 13 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 14 question. 15 A. I don't think that's relevant to this study 16 where there are 20 million particles floating around 17 that are deliberately introduced. 18 Q. So it wouldn't be of clinical interest to 19 you. 20 A. You -- you're confusing two different 21 circumstances. One is whether forced-air warmers pick 22 up bacteria, retain bacteria or somehow eject 23 bacteria. If they do, that's a problem. A second 24 issue, which is what this paper is about, is whether 25 warm air interferes with the laminar flow column. Has</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 nothing to do with bacteria.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And you -- you --</p> <p>3 I think we've established this. You're not</p> <p>4 an expert on laminar flow or how particulates move in</p> <p>5 the environment; right?</p> <p>6 A. I'm not.</p> <p>7 Q. So you -- you basic --</p> <p>8 Did you ask anybody why it was that the</p> <p>9 Amersfoort data appeared so different in terms of the</p> <p>10 particulate counts?</p> <p>11 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>12 question.</p> <p>13 A. I don't remember.</p> <p>14 Q. Was it of interest to you?</p> <p>15 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>16 Q. What do you recall doing in connection with</p> <p>17 that data?</p> <p>18 A. When you do multicenter studies, it's</p> <p>19 absolutely routine and normal for the results to</p> <p>20 differ in the various centers. You -- you expect that</p> <p>21 just by random motion. And it's also true that the</p> <p>22 centers are truly different; they have different</p> <p>23 operating rooms, different anesthesia, different</p> <p>24 protocols, so you expect real differences among sites</p> <p>25 in a multicenter study. But you do a multicenter</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And then Dr. Olmstead took a crack at it; is</p> <p>3 that right?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And then you edited it; correct?</p> <p>6 A. "Edited" is a generous term. Virtually</p> <p>7 every word in the published manuscript was mine.</p> <p>8 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been</p> <p>9 previously marked as Deposition Exhibit 79, which is a</p> <p>10 marked-up draft of your study which eventually was</p> <p>11 published and has been previously marked as (Belani)</p> <p>12 Exhibit 16; correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And you were part of this editing</p> <p>15 process; correct?</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. If we can take a look at draft -- the draft</p> <p>18 page seven, which bears Bates number 50592, and if we</p> <p>19 can look at the middle paragraph starting with "We</p> <p>20 found..."</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Midway down there there is a section</p> <p>23 which in this draft reads, "There were noticeable</p> <p>24 differences in the results between the two operating</p> <p>25 rooms, probably the result of small differences in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 study to enhance generalizability. You take all the</p> <p>2 results you have and you put them together and you</p> <p>3 present the average because that best characterizes</p> <p>4 what you know, and that's what we did here.</p> <p>5 Q. And in this case you did five samples, five</p> <p>6 runs five minutes each in two hospitals; correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And in fact you noted here that there were</p> <p>9 only five measurements; right?</p> <p>10 A. Correct.</p> <p>11 Q. So you're standing behind your proposition</p> <p>12 that this is not an under -- underpowered study;</p> <p>13 correct?</p> <p>14 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>15 question.</p> <p>16 A. Correct.</p> <p>17 Q. Could pooling the data from Amersfoort and</p> <p>18 Utrecht confound the data?</p> <p>19 A. No.</p> <p>20 Q. Why not?</p> <p>21 A. "Confounding" has a specific meaning, has to</p> <p>22 be something that's related to exposure and outcome.</p> <p>23 I don't see how pooling induces confounding.</p> <p>24 Q. Now I think we talked about this before, but</p> <p>25 Gary Hansen did the first draft; is that right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 draping around the OR table, and also perhaps due to</p> <p>2 differences in the laminar flow systems." Do you see</p> <p>3 that?</p> <p>4 A. I do.</p> <p>5 Q. And there was a deleted box beside that, and</p> <p>6 what was deleted is "The significantly higher counts</p> <p>7 seen with the blanket model 635 reflected conditions</p> <p>8 at OR Amersfoort" or "A..." Do you see that?</p> <p>9 A. I see it, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Who made the decision to delete from</p> <p>11 this transcript that there had been significantly</p> <p>12 higher counts seen with the underbody blanket at the</p> <p>13 Amersfoort hospital?</p> <p>14 A. Well, whoever edited the document.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you know if that was Mr. Hansen at 3M?</p> <p>16 A. I have no idea who was editing at this</p> <p>17 point.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Was that something that you had</p> <p>19 drafted originally, that you had found significantly</p> <p>20 higher counts seen with the blanket model 635 in</p> <p>21 Amersfoort?</p> <p>22 A. I'm not sure I understand the question.</p> <p>23 Q. My question is: Do you know whether you</p> <p>24 were the person who originally put in the draft that</p> <p>25 there had been significantly higher counts seen with</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 the underbody blanket at Amersfoort hospital?</p> <p>2 A. I have no idea. Sorry.</p> <p>3 Q. You don't recall.</p> <p>4 A. Not even vaguely. This is from when, 2011,</p> <p>5 and this was years before that.</p> <p>6 Q. Well if you were the one who put it in,</p> <p>7 presumably you -- you put it in originally because you</p> <p>8 thought that would be of interest to clinicians;</p> <p>9 correct?</p> <p>10 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>11 question, lack of foundation.</p> <p>12 A. We don't know that I put it in.</p> <p>13 Q. Well it's consistent with the e-mail</p> <p>14 exchange we just went through; correct?</p> <p>15 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>16 question.</p> <p>17 A. It requires supposition.</p> <p>18 Q. Well would you agree that this statement is</p> <p>19 consistent with your -- the deleted statement is</p> <p>20 consistent with your statement as reflected in the</p> <p>21 e-mails we just went through, Exhibit 12?</p> <p>22 MS. DIFRANCO: Here.</p> <p>23 (Document handed to the witness.)</p> <p>24 A. The statement seems consistent with the</p> <p>25 data. Who put it in, who took it out, I have no idea.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 One thing has nothing to do with the other.</p> <p>2 You think -- you think he did sign this --</p> <p>3 MS. DIFRANCO: I think he did --</p> <p>4 MR. GORDON: -- protective order?</p> <p>5 MS. DIFRANCO: -- in the other case.</p> <p>6 MR. ASSAAD: I believe so.</p> <p>7 MS. DIFRANCO: Yeah.</p> <p>8 MR. GORDON: Okay.</p> <p>9 A. Okay.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. The bottom is a communication between</p> <p>11 Al Van Duren and Linda Johnson; correct?</p> <p>12 A. It appears so.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And it -- it says, "To be brief:</p> <p>14 "Received a number of complaints regarding</p> <p>15 infections.</p> <p>16 "2) Within the MDR reporting requirements</p> <p>17 you are exempt from reporting (Bold Emphasis Mine)</p> <p>18 based on CFR803.20..." Do you see that?</p> <p>19 A. I do.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. And then it bolds that "you do not</p> <p>21 have to report an adverse event if you have</p> <p>22 information that would lead a person who is qualified</p> <p>23 to make a medical judgment reasonably to conclude that</p> <p>24 a device did not cause or contribute to a death or</p> <p>25 serious injury..." Do you see that?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. You'd agree with me that the DIN</p> <p>2 standard that is mentioned in your paper is not</p> <p>3 designed to detect increased particles from a forced-</p> <p>4 air warming device; correct?</p> <p>5 A. The DIN standard was designed to evaluate</p> <p>6 the efficacy of laminar flow.</p> <p>7 Q. Have you ever -- have you ever advised 3M on</p> <p>8 sort of any reporting requirements that it may have</p> <p>9 for infections that people are claiming that they got</p> <p>10 as a result of use of a Bair Hugger in their surgery?</p> <p>11 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>12 question.</p> <p>13 A. Not at all. That's nothing I have any</p> <p>14 expertise in.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. I've handed you what's been</p> <p>16 previously marked as Deposition Exhibit 67, and you</p> <p>17 can take a moment and look at it.</p> <p>18 MR. GORDON: Has Dr. Sessler signed the</p> <p>19 protective order?</p> <p>20 MS. DIFRANCO: I think he did last time.</p> <p>21 MS. CONLIN: Yeah. I -- I mean he's got an</p> <p>22 exclusive consulting relation. I mean I asked --</p> <p>23 that's why I asked him at the beginning if he's under</p> <p>24 confidentiality with 3M.</p> <p>25 MR. GORDON: All right. But I -- I --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 A. I do.</p> <p>2 Q. And then there's -- in the top e-mail</p> <p>3 there's a reply from Mr. Van Duren to Ms. Johnson with</p> <p>4 a number of attachments, and I don't know what was</p> <p>5 written here because it's been redacted, but do you</p> <p>6 see that in the attachment, the first one is your --</p> <p>7 your article?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Do you think that your article</p> <p>10 supports a view that microbial infections can't happen</p> <p>11 with the Bair Hugger?</p> <p>12 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>13 question.</p> <p>14 A. Would you mind repeating that question?</p> <p>15 Q. Sure. Do you believe that your study</p> <p>16 supports the proposition that microbial infections</p> <p>17 cannot occur through use of the Bair Hugger?</p> <p>18 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>19 question.</p> <p>20 A. That seems like a little bit of a convoluted</p> <p>21 wording, so let me answer by saying that I don't</p> <p>22 believe that this study supports risk from forced-air</p> <p>23 warming in terms of infection, and it has to be put in</p> <p>24 context with other available studies that show that</p> <p>25 forced-air warming reduces infection in actual</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 patients, not in laboratory simulations. 2 Q. And my question was a little bit different. 3 Do you think your paper supports the proposition that 4 a patient cannot become infected through use of a Bair 5 Hugger? 6 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 7 question. 8 A. Again this is convoluted wording, but I 9 believe my study shows that forced-air warming does 10 not substantively increase risk. 11 Q. Based on your five -- five samples of five 12 minutes apiece; correct? 13 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 14 question. 15 A. That's all you need for a laboratory-based 16 simulation. 17 Q. Okay. But you haven't -- 18 I mean if it puts it to bed, Dr. Sessler, 19 then why have you been urging Arizant and now 3M for 20 some time to do a study on this issue? 21 MR. GORDON: Object to the form. 22 A. The trouble with this study and all the 23 similar studies is that they're laboratory 24 simulations; they don't involve patients, they don't 25 involve bacteria. These -- these are not -- this is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 I mean have they ever told you that they're 2 getting reports, receiving a number of complaints 3 regarding infection? 4 A. No. 5 Q. Okay. And you've never had any discussions 6 with them on that? 7 A. No. 8 Q. What do you do as a science advisor for 3M 9 in their -- on forced-air warming? 10 A. Well as I said, we haven't met for a long 11 time, but the advisory board when it meets discusses 12 various issues. The last meeting was all about 13 prewarming; that's essentially all we talked about. 14 Q. Okay. But in all these science advisory 15 meetings you've never had a discussion regarding 16 whether use of Bair Hugger can disrupt the currents in 17 the OR? 18 A. I don't remember that being a topic of a 19 meeting. 20 Q. Okay. And in all these science advisory 21 meetings you haven't had discussions about whether the 22 Bair Hugger device itself can harbor microbes? 23 A. Not that I remember, no. 24 Q. Now I think you testified earlier that you 25 understood that 3M had a commercial interest in this</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 not a study of bacteria, it's a study of particulates 2 that are put into the air intentionally to see what 3 happens to them. The obvious next step, if you're 4 concerned one way or the other, whether you believe 5 it's true or whether you don't believe it's true, the 6 obvious next step is to do a study that at least goes 7 into an operating room and involves real patients. 8 That's what I told them. 9 Q. And why have they refused to do that? 10 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 11 question, lack of foundation. 12 A. I haven't a clue. 13 I propose studies all the time. Companies 14 agree to support a small fraction of the ones I 15 propose, and they make their own -- decisions for 16 their own reasons. 17 Q. Okay. No one's ever expressed to you why 18 they refused to do one? 19 A. No. 20 Q. Okay. Now you're doing some current studies 21 for 3M; correct? 22 A. I am. 23 Q. Okay. Well actually, before we get to that, 24 have you talked with 3M at all about whether they have 25 an obligation to --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 study that we've been talking about; correct? 2 A. You mean the Anesthesia & Analgesia -- 3 Q. Correct. 4 A. -- number (Belani) 16? 5 Q. Correct. 6 A. Yes, of course they have an interest. 7 (Discussion off the stenographic record.) 8 BY MS. CONLIN: 9 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been 10 previously marked as Deposition Exhibit No. 11. I'm 11 actually going to ask you about the middle e-mail on 12 page two bearing 24810, and it appears to be -- 13 Do you know who Teri Woodcock-Sides is? 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. Woodwick-Sides. 16 Have you met her before? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. In what context? 19 A. She worked for Arizant and then I believe 20 for 3M. 21 Q. Okay. And it says, "Dear Thomas and Ron, 22 "Great job in recapping the presentations. 23 It is very powerful that Professor Kulpman is speaking 24 (independently) on the topic of forced-air warming and 25 laminar flow. One reason that we are holding the data</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 77	Page 79
<p>1 was to allow time for results to be written up and 2 submitted for publication. We have a researcher in 3 the US interested in co-authoring this research." 4 That person turned out to be you; correct?</p> <p>5 A. It looks like it.</p> <p>6 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 7 question, lack of foundation.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. And do you know whether it was after 9 April 23rd of 2010 that you were first contacted 10 regarding the work that Professor Kuepplmann had done 11 that ultimately became the paper that was co-authored 12 by the two of you?</p> <p>13 A. I have no idea.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Then you see it says, "That said, 15 these results are also part of a legal strategy, which 16 we have been carefully outlining. It is important for 17 our longer-term goals that we do not release it too 18 prematurely." Do you see that?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. Were you aware that the study that 3M 21 contacted you on was part of a legal strategy?</p> <p>22 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 23 question.</p> <p>24 A. No.</p> <p>25 Q. Nobody ever told you that?</p>	<p>1 question, lack of foundation. 2 A. Not often, no. 3 Q. Okay. I mean they -- 3M -- 4 3M put together the protocols for this 5 study; correct?</p> <p>6 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 7 question.</p> <p>8 A. Yes. 9 Q. And 3M personnel conducted the study, Gary 10 Hansen along with -- I think you said Professor 11 Kuepplmann might have been there; right?</p> <p>12 A. Well I believe Dr. Kuepplmann conducted the 13 study.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. We established this before. You 15 don't know.</p> <p>16 A. That's correct. 17 Q. Okay.</p> <p>18 A. I said I believe. 19 Q. Okay. And they sent you the raw data.</p> <p>20 A. Correct. 21 Q. And they sent you a draft manuscript that 22 was written by Gary Hansen.</p> <p>23 A. Correct. 24 Q. And this was part, as you see now, of a 25 legal strategy; correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p> <p>1 MR. GORDON: Same objection. 2 A. No. 3 Q. Would that have been something that you 4 would have wanted to know when they contacted you and 5 said, "We've conducted this study and would like you 6 to be an author on it?" 7 MR. GORDON: Same objection. 8 A. No. That the study was of interest to them 9 and was part of their legal strategy I -- I guess was 10 pretty obvious. 11 Q. So that doesn't surprise you. 12 A. No, it doesn't surprise me. But I don't 13 think I was specifically told. I -- I have not read 14 this previously. 15 Q. Did you ever go back to them and say, you 16 know, "I think we should have additional sampling 17 points and perhaps we should go back and do some 18 additional work at Amersfoort?" 19 A. No. 20 Q. No discussion on that at all? 21 A. No. 22 Q. Do you oftentimes find yourself as a 23 consultant to a company that is part of their legal 24 strategy? 25 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p> <p>1 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 2 question, lack of foundation. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And you worked on it -- I -- 5 I take it you accepted the raw data as 6 accurate? 7 A. I did after discussion with Dr. Kuepplmann. 8 Q. Okay. Did you talk with Gary Hansen about 9 it at all? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. What did you talk with Gary Hansen about, if 12 you recall? 13 A. I don't recall. 14 Q. Now you're doing some consulting work, doing 15 some new studies for 3M; is that right? 16 A. Yes, but -- 17 We are doing studies. It's not consulting 18 though. 19 Q. Okay. Fair enough. You make a dis -- 20 distinction between when you're -- when 3M is funding 21 a research project versus when you're doing consulting 22 work for them; correct? 23 A. Absolutely. 24 Q. Okay. And I -- 25 Is it true that when you're doing consulting</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 81	Page 83
<p>1 work for them, such as like on the 3M advisory board, 2 that's billed separately than if they give you -- if 3 they fund a study and give you money for that; 4 correct?</p> <p>5 A. Correct.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. When they fund a study, does it 7 impact your salary at all or -- or your total 8 compensation?</p> <p>9 A. Absolutely not.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Your --</p> <p>11 How much funding you get from various 12 companies doesn't impact the salary that you're paid.</p> <p>13 A. Not at all.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And can you describe for me what 15 current studies you're performing that 3M is funding 16 right now?</p> <p>17 I'm sorry, --</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. -- let me withdraw that and ask a more 20 specific question.</p> <p>21 What funding is 3M giving you on issues of 22 studies relating to either the Bair Hugger, forced-air 23 warming, or normothermia?</p> <p>24 A. Okay. There are three studies.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay.</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. And what -- tell me what the setup on 2 those registry stud -- what --</p> <p>3 What's the second registry study?</p> <p>4 A. I'm not sure. I'm sorry, I don't remember 5 at the moment. It -- it's some --</p> <p>6 It's the relationship between the 7 intraoperative core temperature and something, --</p> <p>8 Q. Okay.</p> <p>9 A. -- but it's not infection.</p> <p>10 Q. And describe the difference between a 11 randomized --</p> <p>12 A. I don't think -- I don't think it's 13 infection.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Do you know if it is?</p> <p>15 A. I don't remember the study offhand, but I --</p> <p>16 I don't think so. I --</p> <p>17 Q. What is the Spot On project?</p> <p>18 A. That's been completed for several years.</p> <p>19 Q. Would it --</p> <p>20 What was it?</p> <p>21 A. It was an evaluation of a Spot On 22 temperature monitoring system.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Why don't you describe the second 24 registry study for me again. I missed it when you 25 described it.</p>
<p>1 A. Two are registry analyses and one is a 2 randomized trial.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Why don't we start with the three 4 registry analyses -- or the --</p> <p>5 A. Two registry.</p> <p>6 Q. -- two registry analyses.</p> <p>7 A. Okay. One evaluates the relationship 8 between core body temperature during surgery and post- 9 operative myocardial injury.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And what's the name of that study?</p> <p>11 A. I don't believe it has a --</p> <p>12 I mean it has some -- some name, but I don't 13 know what it is.</p> <p>14 Q. Project Protect?</p> <p>15 A. No.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay.</p> <p>17 A. Protect is the randomized trial.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. All right. Okay. And where is that 19 being conducted?</p> <p>20 A. Here.</p> <p>21 By "that" you mean the registry study?</p> <p>22 Q. Yes.</p> <p>23 A. Yeah.</p> <p>24 Q. The one that --</p> <p>25 A. Both registry studies are here.</p>	<p>1 A. Well I described the first registry study, 2 which was core temperature and myocardial injury.</p> <p>3 Q. Right.</p> <p>4 A. The second one I didn't describe because I 5 can't remember what it is at the moment.</p> <p>6 Q. Do you know if it relates to Bair Hugger 7 infections?</p> <p>8 A. I -- I don't think so, but I would have to 9 look it up to be sure.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. I'm going to request that you do 11 that.</p> <p>12 And then what is the randomized trial that's 13 going on?</p> <p>14 A. That's --</p> <p>15 Q. Project Protect?</p> <p>16 A. -- Protect. Protect hasn't started yet, but 17 it will be a randomized trial of very mild hypothermia 18 versus aggressive warming with the primary outcome of 19 myocardial injury.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. The working hypothesis is even small 21 decreases in body temperature can put patients at risk 22 for myocardial issues?</p> <p>23 A. Yes. Or perhaps, turned around, that 24 aggressive warming reduces risk.</p> <p>25 Q. What warming modalities are you using in</p>

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 85		Page 87	
1	that randomized trial?	1	A. It's some modest amount: a couple hundred
2	A. Forced air.	2	dollars per patient.
3	Q. Just the Bair Hugger?	3	Q. No. I meant what's the overall cost of the
4	A. Yes.	4	trial?
5	Q. And where is that taking place?	5	A. I think it's about 1.6 million, most of
6	A. Some patients will be enrolled here, but the	6	which is a pass-through to the sites doing the study.
7	bulk of the study will be done in centers in China.	7	Q. Are you doing, other than those three
8	Q. Okay. And what's the -- what's the -- the	8	projects, any other projects on forced-air warming for
9	protocol? What -- what's the test method?	9	3M?
10	A. Take -- take patients at risk for myocardial	10	A. I don't believe so.
11	injury, randomize them to very mild hypothermia versus	11	MS. CONLIN: I'm going to go into a new
12	aggressive warming, and see whether they develop	12	area, so this might be a good time to take a short
13	myocardial injury.	13	break. I don't know if --
14	Q. So you're actually going make patients	14	We can go off the record.
15	mildly hypothermic?	15	THE REPORTER: Off the record, please.
16	A. In China most patients are not actively	16	(Luncheon recess taken.)
17	warmed, so even the mildly hypothermic group probably	17	
18	gets more warming than they would get otherwise.	18	
19	Q. So in China, it's basically taking regular	19	
20	patients and then using the Bair Hugger on another set	20	
21	and seeing whether there's a difference in myocardial	21	
22	injury?	22	
23	A. I'm not sure I understand the question.	23	
24	Q. Well you said you're taking patients who are	24	
25	mildly hypothermic. You're not inducing mild	25	
Page 86		Page 88	
1	hypothermia in the China study, or are you?	1	AFTERNOON SESSION
2	A. Patients are enrolled based on risk, and	2	BY MS. CONLIN:
3	consent of course, and then in the mild hypothermia	3	Q. This morning, Dr. Sessler, I had asked you
4	group they're allowed to cool to 35.5 degrees and then	4	about whether you had any information regarding the
5	actively warmed to prevent further hypothermia. In	5	filtration efficiency of the Bair Hugger. Do you
6	the aggressive warming group, patients will be	6	recall that testimony?
7	prewarmed and then they'll be aggressively warmed	7	A. Yes.
8	intraoperatively with two different forced-air covers,	8	Q. Okay. Or questioning I should say.
9	surgery permitting, with a goal of having a core	9	I've handed you what's been previously
10	temperature of 37 degrees at the end of surgery.	10	marked as Exhibit 6, which is an e-mail between
11	Q. How many patients are you enrolling?	11	various individuals at 3M.
12	A. We plan 5,000.	12	Have you met a Karl Zgoda before?
13	Q. How many will be here versus China?	13	A. Not that I recall.
14	A. Here will be probably fewer than 200.	14	Q. Okay. But Gary Hansen you have; correct?
15	Q. When do you expect to have that complete?	15	A. Correct.
16	A. Three or four years.	16	Q. And Ryan Barrows?
17	Q. When they were asking you to do this	17	A. Not that I remember.
18	randomized trial, did you go back to them and talk to	18	Q. Okay. And as you see, it says, "As we
19	them about the fact that you still were wondering	19	discussed this morning, please find the media
20	about the infection risk with the Bair Hugger?	20	efficiencies (prior to pleating and filter assembly),"
21	A. They didn't ask me to do the study. I -- I	21	and do you see down there on M20 it's got a 58-percent
22	proposed it, many times, actually, over the course of	22	efficiency at three microns?
23	several years, and finally they agreed.	23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Okay. How much is the trial? What's the	24	Q. Okay. That isn't --
25	funding on the trial, or the budget?	25	MR. GORDON: It's actually .3 microns.

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 1-800-553-1953 info@stirewalt.com

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1. MS. CONLIN: Point three, thank you. 2. Q. Point three microns. Do you see that, doctor? 3. A. I do. 4. Q. And that's not something that you've ever discussed or been aware of with respect to the M20 filter used in the Bair Hugger. 5. A. Correct. 6. Q. Now the report that -- or the paper that you published with Dr. Olmstead and -- Drs. Olmstead and Kuelpmann underwent a peer-review process; is that right? 7. A. Yes. 8. Q. And you'll recall that a number of the reviewers were concerned that there was a conflict of interest by the authors of that study: yourself, Olmstead and Kuelpmann; correct? 9. MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the question. 10. A. I don't recall. 11. Q. I'm going to hand you what's been previously marked as Deposition Exhibit 80, and if you want to take a moment and review that. 12. A. Okay. 13. Q. Okay. Does this refresh your recollection,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1. question. 2. A. I didn't. 3. Q. Do you -- do you know if anyone did? 4. A. I don't know if anyone did. 5. Q. Okay. One of the things that he says is, "You don't provide a good scientific reason to do the study." What did you understand the reason that you were pulled into that study? 6. At the time, you didn't know it was part of a legal strategy; right? 7. A. No. But there were publications saying that forced -- (clearing throat) excuse me -- that forced-air warming disturbed laminar flow, and this study was designed to address that concern. 8. Q. Okay. So it was for the purposes of commercial promotion of the product; correct? 9. A. No. 10. MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the question. 11. A. No. Not at all. To -- to answer the question does forced-air warming interfere with laminar flow. 12. Q. Did 3M ever tell you that they viewed your study as having limitations? 13. A. Come again?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1. Dr. Sessler, that during the peer-review process of your article there were a number of concerns about whether the study was being done to promote the Bair Hugger product? 2. A. I have no recollection of the peer-review process. 3. Q. Okay. But in any event, that's what the section editor of the Anesthesia & Analgesia publication said; correct? 4. A. As -- as I read this, the editor is saying because there are conflicts of interest, that the manuscript should be squeaky clean, which I agree with completely. And we complied. 5. Q. And they said, "You do not provide a good scientific reason to do the study. It might appear that the study was conducted to promote Arizant's products." Correct? 6. A. Did say that. 7. Q. Okay. And when the editor wrote you that, did anybody tell the editor that the study was part of 3M's legal strategy -- 8. MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the question. 9. Q. -- in connection with the Bair Hugger? 10. MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1. Q. Did -- 2. Well I'll ask it more directly. Did 3. Michelle Hulse Stevens ever tell you that she viewed 4. your study as having limitations? 5. A. She didn't. But all studies have 6. limitations. 7. Q. Do you know -- have you ever -- 8. Do you know Dr. William Reed, Bill Reed? 9. A. I don't believe so. 10. Q. Okay. How about Dr. McGovern? 11. A. I don't believe so. 12. Q. Okay. Do you know who Mr. Gauthier or Mr. Albrecht are? 13. A. Mr. Albrecht was an employee of Augustine 14. Biomedical, and that -- that's the sum total of what I 15. know about him. 16. Q. Have you met him before? 17. A. I don't believe so. 18. Q. Okay. Those were two individuals whom you 19. and Dr. Olmstead tried to prevent as being peer 20. review -- peer reviewers on your article; correct? 21. A. I don't remember. I'll take your word for 22. it. 23. Q. Well if you testified to that previously, 24. that would have been a little closer in time; correct? 25.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

	Page 93	Page 95
	<p>1 A. Little closer, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Do you -- do you have any</p> <p>3 recollection of why you would have suggested that</p> <p>4 those two not be peer reviewers on your article?</p> <p>5 A. Yes. It seems -- I guess I -- I thought</p> <p>6 they had a -- a bias in a different direction and that</p> <p>7 they might not be fair reviewers.</p> <p>8 Q. Well you had a bias in one direction; didn't</p> <p>9 you, sir?</p> <p>10 A. I'm not sure I would agree with that. I</p> <p>11 wanted to find the answer.</p> <p>12 Q. Well you -- you weren't even involved in the</p> <p>13 study. You were approached by 3M after it was -- the</p> <p>14 testing had been done; right?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>17 question.</p> <p>18 A. But I --</p> <p>19 Q. And --</p> <p>20 A. I had an interest in publicizing the results</p> <p>21 because I thought they were clear and that the message</p> <p>22 was important --</p> <p>23 Q. Did you --</p> <p>24 A. -- and that they addressed the controversy.</p> <p>25 Q. Did you look at the protocols and whether</p>	<p>1 you've described?</p> <p>2 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>3 question.</p> <p>4 A. Larger -- larger than what?</p> <p>5 Q. Than a joint implant.</p> <p>6 A. I don't know that.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. It's not something that you've ever</p> <p>8 studied or looked at.</p> <p>9 A. It's really not my area.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay.</p> <p>11 (Discussion off the stenographic record.)</p> <p>12 (Exhibit 227 was marked for</p> <p>13 identification.)</p> <p>14 BY MS. CONLIN:</p> <p>15 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been</p> <p>16 marked as Exhibit 227, which is -- appears to be --</p> <p>17 The bottom is an e-mail from Al Van Duren to</p> <p>18 various members at 3M, including Gary Hansen.</p> <p>19 Do you know who Gary Maharaj is?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. You've met him before?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And it's reflecting on a telephone</p> <p>24 call that Al Van Duren had with you on September 21st,</p> <p>25 2010. Do you see that?</p>
	<p>1 there was a conclusion written at the protocols before</p> <p>2 the testing took place?</p> <p>3 A. I don't remember the details.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay.</p> <p>5 A. I-- I simply don't.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Do you think that would be important</p> <p>7 to know, whether it was conducted in a way to have a</p> <p>8 certain outcome base?</p> <p>9 A. How the study is conducted is certainly</p> <p>10 important, and I certainly did review how the study</p> <p>11 was done.</p> <p>12 Q. Now we talked -- when he's pulling that</p> <p>13 out -- we talked a little bit this morning about your</p> <p>14 understanding of epidemiology, and I just want to make</p> <p>15 sure that I have this correct.</p> <p>16 You've never done any analysis of the number</p> <p>17 of bacteria or a bacterium that can cause an infection</p> <p>18 of an implanted foreign material; correct?</p> <p>19 A. Correct.</p> <p>20 Q. And whether that happens through an airborne</p> <p>21 route.</p> <p>22 A. Correct.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And you would agree with me that</p> <p>24 soft-tissue infections are -- require a much larger</p> <p>25 inoculation, correct, because of the host defense that</p>	<p>1 A. Well I haven't read this yet.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Go ahead. Sorry, sir.</p> <p>3 A. Okay.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And this is Al Van Duren reflecting a</p> <p>5 conversation that he had had with you the previous</p> <p>6 day; correct?</p> <p>7 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>8 question, also lack of foundation.</p> <p>9 MS. CONLIN: You may answer.</p> <p>10 Q. See it says, "I talked to Dan Sessler</p> <p>11 yesterday?"</p> <p>12 A. It appears to say that, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And in the next paragraph it says,</p> <p>14 "Dan suggested that we conduct a microbiological study</p> <p>15 by placing culture dishes in the sterile field for a</p> <p>16 fixed duration and analyzing the CFUs." Do you see</p> <p>17 that?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And it goes on to state that you thought you</p> <p>20 were pretty confident that the cost of the study would</p> <p>21 be modest and there would be no significant</p> <p>22 differences in outcomes; correct?</p> <p>23 A. Correct.</p> <p>24 Q. And that was way back in 2010; right?</p> <p>25 A. Correct.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 97	Page 99
<p>1 Q. And this was the -- what we talked about 2 this morning. 3M hasn't undertaken that suggestion 3 even today; correct? 4 A. Not that I know of. 5 Q. And you actually got upset with 3M about 6 their refusal to do a bacterial contamination study; 7 correct? 8 A. Where does it say that? 9 Q. Do you recall being upset with 3M, that they 10 wouldn't undertake a bacterial study -- 11 A. No. 12 Q. -- as you proposed? 13 A. No. 14 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, that's -- 15 what's been previously marked as Deposition Exhibit 16 14, which the cover page appears to be an e-mail from 17 you to Gary Hansen. I'll give you a moment to review 18 it. 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. Do you recall this exchange? 21 A. No. 22 Q. Do you see, if we can take a look at page 23 two of it, it starts with an e-mail from Steven Shafer 24 at Stanford. Do you see that? 25 A. Okay. I -- I've only read the first page so</p>	<p>1 A. Correct. 2 Q. Okay. And he goes on to state, "I don't 3 find the concerns about your intentions credible. 4 Thus, your intentions are not in question. The 5 question before us is entirely scientific: is your 6 study description accurate (e.g., the statement that 7 it complies with an accepted standard), and are your 8 conclusions fully supported by your findings?" Do you 9 see that? 10 A. I do. 11 Q. Okay. And one of the things that they -- 12 criticism they had is that you didn't measure the 13 effects of rising waste heat from forced-air warming 14 devices; correct? 15 In number six. 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Okay. And in fact, I think you've testified 18 previously that it's your understanding that the Bair 19 Hugger generates about 400 watts of heat. 20 A. Correct. 21 Q. About 80 of which are absorbed by the 22 patient; correct? 23 A. That's about right. 24 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 25 question.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 98</p> <p>1 far. 2 Q. Oh, okay. Why don't you go ahead and take a 3 look at the whole document. 4 A. Okay. 5 Q. Have you had a chance to review it? 6 A. I have. 7 Q. Does this refresh your recollection that Dr. 8 Shafer, who was then editor in chief of Anesthesia 9 & -- 10 A. Analgesia. 11 Q. -- Analgesia wrote you in August of 2012 12 regarding the publication of your study? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Okay. And he raises a number of criticisms; 15 correct? 16 A. He does. 17 Q. Okay. And he said, "We have received a 18 credible report suggesting that your recent paper in 19 Anesthesia & Analgesia misrepresents the safety of 20 forced air warming." Do you see that? 21 And it says, "The -- 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. -- "complaint we have received is quite 24 detailed," and then he lists a number of issues with 25 your paper; correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 100</p> <p>1 Q. And 320 of those watts then go into the 2 operating room; correct? 3 A. Correct. 4 Q. And then it goes on to say, "Your study 5 omitted two of the standard test procedures." Do you 6 know what that was about? 7 A. No. 8 Q. And it says under number one, "The 9 'standard' test procedures were not designed to test 10 forced air warming devices." Do you see that? 11 A. I do. 12 Q. Okay. And do you know what that was about? 13 A. Not offhand. 14 Q. Okay. And then you write, in response to 15 this e-mail from the editor of the journal in which 16 your study was published, you write to Gary Hansen, Al 17 Van Duren and Russ Olmstead as well as Dr. Kuepmann; 18 correct? 19 A. Correct. 20 Q. And you say, "Hi Folks, 21 "We have a problem, in the form of an 22 official complaint, obviously from Scott Augustine, 23 about the laminar flow paper." 24 Why did you assume it was obviously from 25 Scott Augustine?</p>

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 1-800-553-1953 info@stirewalt.com

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 101	Page 103
<p>1 A. I don't remember why I assumed it.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Have you ever seen any publications</p> <p>3 by doctors at Stanford that raise concerns about the</p> <p>4 lack of filtration efficiency in Bair Huggers?</p> <p>5 A. Not that I remember.</p> <p>6 Q. Are you aware of an outbreak of</p> <p>7 Acinetobacter baumannii --</p> <p>8 Did I pronounce that correct?</p> <p>9 A. Acinetobacter.</p> <p>10 Q. Thank you. Yeah, Acinetobacter.</p> <p>11 -- that occurred in a hospital in Kentucky?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. Are you aware that after they changed the</p> <p>14 Bair Hugger filters, the outbreak stopped?</p> <p>15 A. No. But that's meaningless.</p> <p>16 Q. "Meaningless." What do you mean?</p> <p>17 A. That's a typical regression-to-mean,</p> <p>18 before-and-after type issue. That's scientifically</p> <p>19 meaningless, to do before-and-after studies that --</p> <p>20 that have almost no scientific value --</p> <p>21 Q. Well --</p> <p>22 A. -- because --</p> <p>23 Q. -- if -- if you're out there promoting the</p> <p>24 safety of the Bair Hugger, aren't these things that</p> <p>25 you should actually know about, doctor?</p>	<p>1 Q. The fact that they found Bair Huggers</p> <p>2 contaminated with this particular bacteria, had an</p> <p>3 outbreak in the hospital, and the outbreak stopped</p> <p>4 after they changed the filters and cleaned the</p> <p>5 machine.</p> <p>6 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>7 question, it misstates -- mischaracterizes the facts.</p> <p>8 A. With what you've told me, I can't tell</p> <p>9 whether this is important or not.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. But in any event, it's not something</p> <p>11 that you knew about; right?</p> <p>12 A. I'm sorry, I didn't hear that.</p> <p>13 Q. It's not anything that you knew about before</p> <p>14 today; correct?</p> <p>15 A. I did not.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. So you write to, in connection with</p> <p>17 this letter by Dr. -- or e-mail from Dr. Shafer of</p> <p>18 Stanford University, you write to Gary Hansen, Al Van</p> <p>19 Duren, Russ Olmstead and Dr. Kuepmann; right?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And you say in the second sentence,</p> <p>22 "Steve wants to discuss the issue with me on Sunday</p> <p>23 and I need to have a full and convincing response</p> <p>24 ready. Unfortunately, this topic is well outside my</p> <p>25 area of expertise so I'm going to need your help." Do</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 102</p> <p>1 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of that</p> <p>2 question, argumentative.</p> <p>3 A. I can't know everything.</p> <p>4 Q. But in any event, it's meaningless to you;</p> <p>5 right?</p> <p>6 A. Before-and-after data are absolutely</p> <p>7 meaningless.</p> <p>8 Q. And the fact that the outbreak stopped after</p> <p>9 changing of the Bair Hugger filter doesn't matter to</p> <p>10 you as somebody who's out there promoting the safety</p> <p>11 of Bair Hugger; is that right?</p> <p>12 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>13 question.</p> <p>14 A. That is absolutely meaningless data.</p> <p>15 Before-and-after studies are confounded by the fact</p> <p>16 that many things change simultaneously. You have a</p> <p>17 Hawthorne effect, you have regression to mean. It's</p> <p>18 just of no value.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And my question was a little bit</p> <p>20 different. If somebody is out there promoting the</p> <p>21 safety of Bair Hugger, it's not important data to you;</p> <p>22 right?</p> <p>23 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>24 question.</p> <p>25 A. What's not important data?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 104</p> <p>1 you see that?</p> <p>2 A. I do.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Is it your position, at least as</p> <p>4 reflected in this e-mail, that the questions raised</p> <p>5 about your study were outside your area of expertise?</p> <p>6 A. Some of them were for sure.</p> <p>7 Q. Why don't we go through on --</p> <p>8 On the seven points raised, why don't you</p> <p>9 tell me which ones are outside your area of expertise.</p> <p>10 A. Number one I don't think is relevant. Two</p> <p>11 and three are outside my area.</p> <p>12 Q. Well okay. One, is one outside your area of</p> <p>13 expertise?</p> <p>14 A. I'm not sure how to answer that. I don't</p> <p>15 think it's relevant.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay.</p> <p>17 A. I --</p> <p>18 Q. But in any event, do you claim to have any</p> <p>19 expertise in DIN standards?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Number two, "Your study omitted two</p> <p>22 of the standard test procedures" for DIN. Is that</p> <p>23 something within -- that you can talk about?</p> <p>24 A. No.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. How about number three, "Your study</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 105	Page 107
<p>1 omitted the second part of the standard test procedure 2 used in the study?"</p> <p>3 A. No.</p> <p>4 Q. Not within your area of expertise.</p> <p>5 How about four, "You modified the standard 6 procedures so that the results would support this 7 device?"</p> <p>8 A. Part -- partially in my area.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. In what way?</p> <p>10 A. Well I -- I don't think we did modify the -- 11 the standard procedures, and the modifications we made 12 were not designed to support a particular conclusion.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Well you weren't involved in the 14 upfront part of this; --</p> <p>15 A. That's fair. Fair -- fair --</p> <p>16 Q. -- is that right?</p> <p>17 A. -- enough. Fair enough. But --</p> <p>18 Q. So I mean --</p> <p>19 A. -- the -- the protocol, as -- as I 20 understand it, was designed to get the right answer, 21 not to prove a point.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. But you don't know whether that 23 protocol actually was designed to get a particular 24 answer.</p> <p>25 A. Doesn't so matter -- much matter why it was</p>	<p>1 heat to the head end of the patient." Do you see 2 that?</p> <p>3 A. I see that.</p> <p>4 Q. Is that within your area of expertise?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And what would be your response to 7 number seven?</p> <p>8 A. About 90 percent of all forced-air warming 9 is done with upper-body covers, and so that is the 10 relevant condition.</p> <p>11 Q. Then you say, in this next part of your 12 e-mail forwarding the inquiry by Dr. Shafer at 13 Stanford, you say, "I suppose I should point out the 14 obvious. For a year I've been saying that the only 15 way to put this issue to bed is to do a clinical 16 bacterial sampling study. We should have had those 17 results by now -- which would fully address this 18 issue. As is, we're again playing catch up. It was a 19 foolish decision not to do that study long ago." Do 20 you see that?</p> <p>21 A. I do.</p> <p>22 Q. And that's consistent with what you've been 23 testifying here today; correct?</p> <p>24 A. I still think the study would be useful.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And then Gary Hansen writes back on</p>
<p>1 designed or what the theory was. Either it addresses 2 the question -- either the test procedures are 3 appropriate and answer the question or they were not 4 appropriate.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Number six, "You did not measure the 6 effects of rising heat waste from forced air warming 7 devices," that's outside your area of expertise; 8 right?</p> <p>9 A. We did measure the effects of rising heat. 10 That was the whole point of the study.</p> <p>11 Q. Where in your study does it talk about 12 rising heat?</p> <p>13 A. It's the comparison between the ambient 14 temperature and the heated condition. It's exactly 15 testing that.</p> <p>16 Q. For five minutes.</p> <p>17 A. The measurement was for five minutes.</p> <p>18 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>19 A. It's -- it's a laboratory test. You don't 20 need to measure it for ever and ever. It doesn't 21 change.</p> <p>22 Q. And then it said, seven, "You detected" -- 23 "You studied the device in an artificial setting where 24 the rising waste heat phenomenon was least likely to 25 be detectable over the surgical site - restricting the</p>	<p>1 August 31st and says, "There is much to say, and I've 2 already worked through most of it. Let me pull it 3 together." Do you see that?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And then you write Gary back on that 6 same day and say, "Gary, 7 I'm pretty unhappy. I took this project on 8 as a favor and it has ended up costing a huge amount 9 of time -- and now more to come. Further, this may 10 damage my reputation; just the fact that a complaint 11 was filed already has to some extent." Do you see 12 that?</p> <p>13 A. I do.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. And so you took this project on not 15 for scientific reasons but as a favor to 3M as 16 reflected in this e-mail; correct?</p> <p>17 A. No. I took it on to try to answer the 18 question because I thought the literature that was 19 being published misstated the circumstances.</p> <p>20 Q. Well what did you mean when you said, "I 21 took this project on as a favor and it has ended up 22 costing a huge amount of time" and that it may damage 23 your reputation? What were you referencing there?</p> <p>24 A. Well the -- the fact that a complaint has 25 been filed certainly is potentially damaging. Just</p>

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 109	Page 111
<p>1 the fact that a complaint is filed is damaging even if 2 it turns out to be okay.</p> <p>3 Q. What do you mean when you say, "I took this 4 project on as a favor...?"</p> <p>5 A. Well I wasn't paid for it, if that -- 6 This was not a contract. I didn't get paid 7 for this.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. And then you go on to say, you know, 9 "I've been talking about doing a bacterial sampling 10 study;" right?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Then you go on to say, "I'm under -- I'm 13 overwhelmed with the way Arizant/3M is being 14 managed. It has taken forever to get the analysis for 15 DTT."</p> <p>16 What's that?</p> <p>17 A. Deep temperature thermometer.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And it says, "As a result, you're 19 going into your big launch without a validation paper, 20 even submitted, much less in the press." What's that 21 a reference to?</p> <p>22 A. That they're launching a product without a 23 validation paper in press.</p> <p>24 Q. What's a validation paper?</p> <p>25 A. It's a study showing that the product works.</p>	<p>1 Advisory Board meeting of October 18th, 2012, showing 2 you present with others. You can take a moment, if 3 you'd like, to review it.</p> <p>4 A. This goes on for a long time. Do you want 5 me to read the whole thing?</p> <p>6 Q. Well no. I mean what I'm going to do is ask 7 you about certain things and see if you remember them, 8 and if you want to take a moment and review on either 9 side, you're welcome to do so.</p> <p>10 A. Well let's do it that way.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Do you remember being at a Global 12 Patient Warming Advisory Board meeting?</p> <p>13 This is the advisory board meetings that you 14 described earlier today; correct?</p> <p>15 A. It is.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Do you get minutes of these meetings?</p> <p>17 A. No, I don't.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. And if we look down under the 19 "Summary," there's the proposed troponin study --</p> <p>20 A. Tro -- troponin.</p> <p>21 Q. -- troponin study by you, and -- and you 22 described that earlier today. Is that that randomized 23 trial?</p> <p>24 A. That's correct.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. I forgot to ask you: What was the</p>
<p>1 Q. Okay. Do you know whether the Bair Hugger 2 was launched without a validation paper?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Yes, it was launched without a validation 5 paper, or yes, you know?</p> <p>6 A. Yes, it was launched without a validation 7 paper.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Do you know it --</p> <p>9 It got approval at the FDA as a 510(k); 10 correct?</p> <p>11 A. I believe so.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Do you know what the predicate device 13 was that was used for that 510(k)?</p> <p>14 A. No.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you know whether it was a cast drying 16 device that was manufactured in 1937 through 1943?</p> <p>17 A. I -- I know nothing about the approval 18 process.</p> <p>19 Q. Did you talk with Mr. Hansen, either by 20 e-mail or over the phone or in person, regarding your 21 e-mail to him of August 31st, 2012?</p> <p>22 A. Probably, but I don't remember.</p> <p>23 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been 24 previously marked as Deposition Exhibit 218, which 25 appears to be minutes of a Global Patient Warming</p>	<p>1 Spot On trial that is concluded? That related to the 2 Spot On device; is that right?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay.</p> <p>5 A. Or wait, wait. I'm sorry. What was the 6 question?</p> <p>7 Q. Well we talked about the Spot On trial 8 earlier today, and I was --</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. -- just --</p> <p>11 I couldn't remember what the technology was 12 in it.</p> <p>13 A. It's a zero heat flux.</p> <p>14 Q. Meaning what?</p> <p>15 A. Meaning it's a surface thermometer that's 16 heated --</p> <p>17 Basically, it's a heat flux transducer and a 18 heater, and you servo control the heater to no heat 19 flux, at which point there's -- the device becomes a 20 perfect insulator by definition, and you get a little 21 tunnel of warmth that goes down about a centimeter. 22 You put the thermometer some place like the forehead 23 where one centimeter down is core temperature, then 24 you can read core temperature quite accurately from 25 the skin surface.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 113	Page 115
<p>1 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>2 And then if we look under -- and this is all</p> <p>3 part of the summary -- if we look at the last section</p> <p>4 of the summary of this advisory board meeting, under</p> <p>5 "Other" it says, "Board approved of proposed 3M/CCL</p> <p>6 particulate study to counter 'Blowing Air Is Risky'</p> <p>7 claim from competitors; particularly interested in</p> <p>8 looking at patient prep phase since clinicians often</p> <p>9 do not use forced-air warming here." Do you see that?</p> <p>10 A. I do.</p> <p>11 Q. So as part of your work on 3M's advisory</p> <p>12 board, you were advising them on how to counter some</p> <p>13 of the statements that Scott Augustine was making;</p> <p>14 correct?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And had you been involved in that?</p> <p>17 A. Not at all.</p> <p>18 Q. Other than advising --</p> <p>19 A. I -- I'm --</p> <p>20 Q. -- them and --</p> <p>21 A. Well I --</p> <p>22 Q. -- telling them to move forward on it?</p> <p>23 A. I was certainly not involved in this study</p> <p>24 that's being talked about here. I don't even know</p> <p>25 what it is --</p>	<p>1 become -- be an advisor for him, and I declined.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And did part of your --</p> <p>3 Did you discuss with him whether you</p> <p>4 would, if you accepted that position, take an</p> <p>5 ownership interest in the company?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And what was that discussion?</p> <p>8 A. It was just an absolutely routine</p> <p>9 negotiation about, if he wants me to do something,</p> <p>10 what do I expect in return.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And as part of that, it was an actual</p> <p>12 piece of the company; correct?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. And Dr. Augustine said no; right?</p> <p>15 A. We mutually disagreed. I -- I don't -- I</p> <p>16 don't think he objected to my having ownership in the</p> <p>17 company. We couldn't agree on an amount.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay.</p> <p>19 A. It was just an absolutely standard</p> <p>20 negotiation.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay.</p> <p>22 A. Nothing unusual about it.</p> <p>23 Q. And that was prior to the time you went on</p> <p>24 the 3M science advisory board?</p> <p>25 A. I don't know.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 114</p> <p>1 Q. Okay.</p> <p>2 A. -- or if it ever happened.</p> <p>3 Q. Well you were at the meeting though. Do you</p> <p>4 remember anything about this?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Do you think it's appropriate in your</p> <p>7 role as a scientific advisor to be advising and</p> <p>8 improving -- or approving competitive campaigns?</p> <p>9 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>10 question.</p> <p>11 A. My goal is always to get the right answer</p> <p>12 and to get the truth out.</p> <p>13 Q. Now you know Dr. Augustine well; correct?</p> <p>14 A. I know him -- I've --</p> <p>15 I've known Dr. Augustine for more than two</p> <p>16 decades, --</p> <p>17 Q. Okay.</p> <p>18 A. -- not well. I haven't talked to him in</p> <p>19 years.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. There was a point in time in which</p> <p>21 you wanted an interest in his Hot Dog company;</p> <p>22 correct?</p> <p>23 A. No.</p> <p>24 Q. That never happened?</p> <p>25 A. No. He approached me and asked me to</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 116</p> <p>1 Q. So if we can take a look at page six of</p> <p>2 this, Dr. Sessler, it bears the last three Bates</p> <p>3 numbers 445. Do you, Dr. --</p> <p>4 By the way, Dr. Sessler, do you have shares</p> <p>5 in any patient-warming company?</p> <p>6 A. Yes. I have stock options, I think, for</p> <p>7 VitaHEAT --</p> <p>8 Q. Okay.</p> <p>9 A. -- that date back before their current</p> <p>10 arrangement with 3M. But any fees or compensation I</p> <p>11 get, including stock options, related to warming, I</p> <p>12 donate to charity. I've done this for -- for many</p> <p>13 years, and I've made it absolutely clear to everyone</p> <p>14 that -- that all this work is -- is essentially pro</p> <p>15 bono.</p> <p>16 Q. You weren't involved in advising 3M in</p> <p>17 connection with its arrangement with VitaHEAT?</p> <p>18 A. Absolutely not.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Did you know that 3M was considering</p> <p>20 taking an exclusive license to VitaHEAT?</p> <p>21 A. I had no inkling.</p> <p>22 Q. So if we take a look at page six, this is</p> <p>23 under the heading --</p> <p>24 Well it's your proposed study in China;</p> <p>25 right?</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p> <p>1 A. I don't know. I'm sorry, I haven't read 2 this yet.</p> <p>3 Q. If you look at the page before, in five 4 there's a heading, and would this have been a 5 presentation that you made at this meeting, or are 6 these a summary of the points that you made at the 7 meeting regarding your proposed study in China?</p> <p>8 A. It -- I believe it was a presentation.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And then at the --</p> <p>10 If we look at the two bullet points at the 11 top of page six, there's a notation, "Kurz 1996 SSI- 12 paper limitations," and it says, "only 200 patients, 13 mostly superficial infections with few clinical 14 consequences (we should focus on deep tissue/organ 15 SSIs), the factor of 3 risk increase is not plausible 16 (30 percent or so is more likely)." Do you see that?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Was that information that you presented 19 during this advisory meeting at 3M?</p> <p>20 A. Apparently.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Then you went on to say, "Melling 22 paper seriously flawed: only 420 low risk patients, 23 infection was not defined, core temperature not 24 recorded (!)" See that?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 speed and leave you exposed. Large outcomes studies 2 are needed to take the place of the old studies."</p> <p>3 Is that something that you recall mentioning 4 to 3M at this meeting?</p> <p>5 A. No.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Do you deny that you said it?</p> <p>7 A. Oh, no. It looks like I did, I just don't 8 recall it.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Then if we take a look at page seven, 10 midway down it's "Hooper/laminar flow in hip/knee 11 replacements." Do you recall what that's about?</p> <p>12 A. Only vaguely.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. What is the Hooper/laminar flow in 14 hip/knee replacements?</p> <p>15 A. I know --</p> <p>16 I don't remember the study, so I know 17 nothing except what I'm reading right here, which is 18 not enough for me to discuss it.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And do you see that Al Van Duren 20 said, "Shows laminar flow is not effective. But 21 potentially could be interpreted to mean that 22 forced-air warming disturbs laminar flow, causing 23 laminar flow not to work." Do you recall him saying 24 that?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 Q. Do you agree that the Melling paper is 2 seriously flawed, as you stated to 3M?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And do you agree with me that you 5 told 3M that the Kurz 1996 SSI paper has limitations 6 and you identified them to 3M?</p> <p>7 A. All papers have limitations.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Now if we go down --</p> <p>9 Well, and you in fact mentioned these 10 limitations on the Kurz study to 3M at this meeting as 11 reflected in these notes; correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Then we go down and it's got sort 14 of a -- almost like a Q&A. It says "Question: why 15 should 3M fund a study to show risks associated with 16 hypothermia when there is already broad acceptance of 17 current evidence?"</p> <p>18 And then there's a "DS." Is that referring 19 to you?</p> <p>20 A. I assume.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. It says, "the threat to 3M is that 22 the old studies will begin to be discredited."</p> <p>23 Is that a reference to Melling and Kurz?</p> <p>24 A. Probably.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. "Once this begins it will pick up</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 Q. And if we take a look on the last page, page 2 eight, it says, "Discussion of new aerobiology study 3 to counter the 'BAIR' misinformation." And it says, 4 "GH" -- I assume that's Gary Hansen -- "presented 5 study proposal. Board supported the idea."</p> <p>6 Then it goes on to say "DS" -- which is 7 you -- "Host defense protects against SSI much more 8 than sterile ORs and external conditions. This study 9 would take the wind out of the 'BAIR' argument. That 10 is the only reason to do it."</p> <p>11 Do you see that there?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Does that sound like a statement you would 14 have made?</p> <p>15 A. I -- I don't really know what the new 16 aerobiology study is, so I don't think I can comment 17 here.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. We did talk today a little bit about 19 your view that the host defense protects against 20 surgical-site infections; right?</p> <p>21 A. Host defense is absolutely critical.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. But you don't know whether --</p> <p>23 Well let me ask it this way: What is the 24 host defense if a bacterium lands on an implant, like 25 a knee?</p>

30 (Pages 117 to 120)

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 1-800-553-1953 info@stirewalt.com

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 121	Page 123
<p>1 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 2 question. 3 A. Host defense still applies. 4 Q. Okay. Do you know whether the host defense 5 is significantly impeded in connection with an 6 implant? 7 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 8 question. 9 A. I -- I don't know. I believe that -- 10 I simply don't know. 11 Q. Okay. 12 (Exhibit 228 was marked for 13 identification.) 14 BY MS. CONLIN: 15 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been 16 marked as Exhibit 228, which appears to be an e-mail 17 between you and Scott Augustine with a copy to Bob 18 Buehler. 19 Do you know a Bob Buehler? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Who is that? 22 MS. CONLIN: Is your phone going off? Do 23 you need step out? 24 MS. DIFRANCO: It's mine. 25 MS. CONLIN: Okay. I want to -- I know</p>	<p>1 nearly the same as forced-air warming..." Was that a 2 true statement? 3 A. I'm sorry, I'm not seeing the sentence at 4 the moment. 5 Q. Oh, I'm sorry, doctor, right down there. 6 A. Oh, okay. Sorry. I was in a different 7 paragraph here. 8 Q. Sorry. 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Okay. And that's true today in your mind; 11 correct? 12 A. Yes. 13 (Exhibit 229 was marked for 14 identification.) 15 BY MS. CONLIN: 16 Q. I've handed you what's been marked as 17 Exhibit 229. The cover page appears to be an e-mail 18 from you to Al Van Duren dated April -- I'm sorry, May 19 30th, 2014, and attached is a study co-authored by you 20 and others entitled "A Randomized Comparison of 21 Intraoperative PerfecTemp and Forced-Air Warming 22 During Open Abdominal Surgery." 23 Was this a study that you were involved in? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Okay. And what was your involvement in this</p>
<p>1 you're a doctor, so I wanted to make sure. All right. 2 Q. Who is Bob Buehler, or do you know who Bob 3 Buehler is? 4 A. I do know Bob Buehler. He worked for Scott. 5 I don't know his title or role. 6 Q. Okay. And this is dated 2000, and if we 7 could take a look at the third paragraph down, you 8 write, "I do not at all support the statement that 9 'forced air is the standard of care.' For one thing, 10 it's not even a true statement! More than half of all 11 patients in the United States (to say nothing of the 12 world) do not receive force-air warming." 13 Now this is written in 2000, but did you 14 believe that to be accurate when you wrote it? 15 A. I probably wrote it because I believed it to 16 be accurate. 17 Q. Okay. And then midway down that -- 18 Well actually, midway down it says, "After 19 all, many patients can be kept warm with passive 20 insulation alone. Others can be kept normothermic 21 with less effective technologies." 22 Was that a true statement when you wrote it? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Okay. And then in the next paragraph you 25 write, "The efficacy of electric warming blankets is</p>	<p>1 study? 2 A. I designed the protocol, supervised data 3 acquisition, I supervised statistical analysis, and 4 heavily edited -- probably wrote -- most of the 5 manuscript. 6 Q. Okay. And PerfecTemp is an underbody 7 resistive-warming system that combines servo- 8 controlled underbody warming with viscoelastic foam 9 pressure relief? 10 A. Apparently. 11 Q. Is this -- is this the -- the VitaHEAT? 12 A. I don't think so. 13 Q. Okay. How -- how does it differ, if at all, 14 than the VitaHEAT product? 15 A. I -- I can't tell you. 16 Q. Okay. If we can take a look at the 17 conclusion, which is on Bates page 694, "In 18 summary..." Do you see that on the left-hand side 19 right before "DISCLOSURES?" 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Okay. You and the other authors conclude, 22 "In summary, mean intraoperative TWA" -- 23 That's time-weighted average; am I right, 24 doctor? 25 A. You are.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 125	Page 127
<p>1 Q. Okay. "In summary, mean intraoperative TWA 2 core temperatures were no different, and significantly 3 noninferior, with underbody resistive heating than 4 upper-body forced-air warming. Underbody resistive 5 heating may be an alternative to forced-air warming." 6 That's what you concluded in this study that 7 was published in 2011; am I right?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And have you seen any counter evidence to -- 10 that would undermine the conclusions that you reached 11 in this study?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 (Exhibit 230 was marked for 14 identification.)</p> <p>15 BY MS. CONLIN:</p> <p>16 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been 17 marked as Exhibit 230, which is an e-mail exchange 18 between Niya Johnson and Michelle Hulse Stevens with a 19 copy to Al Van Duren. Do you see that?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Dated November 18th, 2015, "Subject: BMW 22 refocus: pre-warming." Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And it says, "Michelle, 25 "I'd like to extend you an invitation to</p>	<p>1 (Recess taken.)</p> <p>2 BY MS. CONLIN:</p> <p>3 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been 4 previously marked as Deposition Exhibit 222. It 5 starts, actually, with an e-mail from you on the third 6 page, so you might want to start on the third page 7 and -- and read up.</p> <p>8 A. Oh, okay.</p> <p>9 Okay.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. If we can take a look at the third 11 page bearing Bates 541796 of Exhibit 222 first, you 12 write to a number of people at 3M; am I right?</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. About a --</p> <p>15 Sounds to me like there was a key-opinion- 16 leader meeting in Washington. Was that in connection 17 with your work for 3M or was that just on the SCIP-10 18 protocol in general?</p> <p>19 A. I don't know.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. It says, "One of the points 21 Andrea" --</p> <p>22 Who is Andrea?</p> <p>23 A. Probably Andrea Kurz.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay.</p> <p>25 -- "Andrea Kurz and I tried to make at the</p>
<p>1 join the BMW team call" -- or "team on a call with two 2 KOLs and experts on pre-warming Dr. Brauer and Dr. 3 Sessler." Do you see that?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. What -- what is the BMW?</p> <p>6 MR. GORDON: Objection, lack of foundation.</p> <p>7 A. I haven't a clue.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Are you working with 3M on a 9 prewarming project?</p> <p>10 A. No.</p> <p>11 Q. It says "on pre-warming," do you see that, 12 "call with two KOLs and experts on pre-warming Dr. 13 Brauer and Dr. Sessler?"</p> <p>14 A. I see that.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. But you're not aware of any work 16 you're doing with 3M on prewarming right now?</p> <p>17 A. We -- we are not doing work with 3M on 18 prewarming now.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Do you know if BMW refers to Bair 20 Mobile Warming?</p> <p>21 MR. GORDON: Objection, lack of foundation.</p> <p>22 A. No, I don't. I have no idea what it means.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay.</p> <p>24 THE REPORTER: We have to change disks. Off 25 the record, please.</p>	<p>1 KOL meeting in Washington is that the evidence for 2 hypothermia-related complications mostly does not meet 3 current research guidelines for reliability and that 4 previous studies were done with much larger 5 temperature differences than are currently allowed."</p> <p>6 What do you mean by that?</p> <p>7 A. The major trials showing that hypothermia 8 causes complications mostly compared temperatures of 9 about 36.5 to about 34.5; no patients now are allowed 10 to get to 34.5.</p> <p>11 Q. And then in the third paragraph you say, 12 "The writing is on the wall. Without new evidence of 13 harm from current levels of hypothermia, SCIP-10 is 14 unlikely to survive into the next version of pay-for- 15 performance measures."</p> <p>16 What's that a reference to?</p> <p>17 A. SCIP-10 is Surgical Care Improvement 18 Project, 10 was one of many measures defining quality 19 criteria, and warming and maintaining normothermia was 20 one of them.</p> <p>21 Q. And --</p> <p>22 A. That -- that -- that's what number 10 was.</p> <p>23 Q. And you were involved in that, right, that 24 proposal?</p> <p>25 A. I -- I was -- I was somewhat involved in</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 129	Page 131
<p>1 that, in the original version.</p> <p>2 Q. And how would you describe your involvement?</p> <p>3 A. I was one of many, many people. I</p> <p>4 represented the ASA, I believe, --</p> <p>5 Q. Okay.</p> <p>6 A. -- American Society of Anesthesiologists, at</p> <p>7 their request.</p> <p>8 Q. And the pay for performance is a reference</p> <p>9 to the fact that because the SCIP-10 protocol is in</p> <p>10 place ensures and the government will reimburse for</p> <p>11 warming modalities in order to keep the patient</p> <p>12 normothermic; correct?</p> <p>13 A. Not quite.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. How would you describe it?</p> <p>15 A. SCIP-10 -- well, called pay for</p> <p>16 performance -- was initially only pay for reporting,</p> <p>17 so you -- if you reported what you did and the</p> <p>18 outcomes, you would get -- you would continue to be</p> <p>19 paid the normal amount. So this was independent of</p> <p>20 the outcome; all you had to do was report. Then</p> <p>21 eventually it turned into -- was called pay for</p> <p>22 performance. Actually, it was a two-percent, I think,</p> <p>23 decrease in payment if you didn't follow the measure.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Thank you. It said -- and so what is</p> <p>25 your --</p>	<p>1 in; is that right?</p> <p>2 A. Apparently.</p> <p>3 Q. To a group at 3M. It says, "All,</p> <p>4 "I think it is true that the RCT data are</p> <p>5 old and will not hold under scrutiny soon. Having</p> <p>6 said that the CDC SSS guideline draft statements on</p> <p>7 warming will continue to recommend active warming but cite</p> <p>8 the need for more research on whether there are</p> <p>9 differences in modality." Do you see that?</p> <p>10 A. I do.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And RCT is a reference to randomized</p> <p>12 clinical trial?</p> <p>13 A. Randomized controlled trial, actually.</p> <p>14 Q. Does SCIP-10 still exist?</p> <p>15 A. And that's a good question.</p> <p>16 Q. It's not a trick question. I don't know the</p> <p>17 answer, which is why I'm asking you.</p> <p>18 A. I believe SCIP-10 was required -- was retired</p> <p>19 because there was no longer a performance gap.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay.</p> <p>21 A. But I -- I'm not completely sure on what the</p> <p>22 current standard is. Well the SCIP -- actually, the</p> <p>23 SCIP measures broadly have been retired, so there's a</p> <p>24 whole different quality process now.</p> <p>25 (Exhibit 231 was marked for</p>
<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 133	Page 135
<p>1 and in the background for this protocol the infection 2 rate is 13 percent - why is there such a difference 3 from what was achieved in 1996 and the current -- 4 current status?" Do you see that?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. And then you wrote him back, right, --</p> <p>7 A. I did.</p> <p>8 Q. -- with respect to that?</p> <p>9 And you -- you numbered your e-mail to 10 respond to the questions he had in the e-mail to you; 11 correct?</p> <p>12 A. Looks like it.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And in response to number three you 14 say, "Presumably, the infection rates differ because 15 the institutions and definitions differ. Importantly, 16 about half the Clinic cases are inflammatory bowel 17 disease, a group with a high infection rate, where 18 most patients in the 1996 trial had colon cancer. The 19 treatment reported in 1996 is implausibly high (that 20 is, the infection rate probably wasn't actually as low 21 as in our 100 warmed patients). Knowing what we do 22 now about fragile clinical trials, we would never have 23 published such a small study."</p> <p>24 Do you see that?</p> <p>25 A. I do.</p>	<p>1 multifactorial, and therefore any one treatment tends 2 to have a relatively small effect. Short of something 3 like antibiotics or vaccines, we're usually dealing 4 with 30-percent effects, not factor-of-three effects.</p> <p>5 So the factor of three is what we got; it --</p> <p>6 it is an accurate statement of the true results. The 7 question is: If we repeated that study 50 times, 8 would you get the same thing each time? Well no, of 9 course not, we would get something different.</p> <p>10 Probably that something different would be a lot less 11 than a factor of three.</p> <p>12 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>13 I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been 14 previously marked as Deposition Exhibit 39, which 15 appears to be an exchange between you and a Martin 16 Grady at Ameritech. Do you know who that is?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Who is Martin Grady?</p> <p>19 A. Martin Grady is anesthesia staff at the 20 Cleveland Clinic. That's just his private e-mail 21 address.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And you start out on the last page 23 and --</p> <p>24 A. Oh, sorry.</p> <p>25 Q. -- say you hope you're enjoying your</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 134</p> <p>1 Q. Is that a reference to the -- what's known 2 as the 1996 Kurz study?</p> <p>3 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And what did you mean by knowing what 5 you know now, you wouldn't have published such a small 6 study?</p> <p>7 A. In 1996, 200 patients was considered a large 8 trial. Now it would be considered a tiny study.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And can you clarify for me this 10 sentence about "The treatment reported in 1996 is 11 implausibly high...?" Do you have evidence on that 12 infection rate? I was just curious.</p> <p>13 A. I'm sorry. Well --</p> <p>14 You asked two questions there I think.</p> <p>15 Q. Yeah. Well first you say, "The treatment 16 reported in 1996 is implausibly high..." What are you 17 referencing there?</p> <p>18 A. I am not referencing anything. I'm making a 19 statement of -- a judgment statement.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. So then you go on to say "...(that 21 is, the infection rate probably wasn't actually as low 22 as in our 100 warmed patients)," and I was just 23 curious how you arrived at that.</p> <p>24 A. Well what -- what I'm saying is that 25 infections, like almost all outcomes, are</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 136</p> <p>1 vacation. You met with a company this morning that is 2 developing a new temperature monitor. What's that a 3 refer -- a reference to?</p> <p>4 A. Spot On.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. And then you ask him a number of 6 questions; correct?</p> <p>7 A. Apparently.</p> <p>8 Q. Number one is: "Do you routinely use BIS 9 monitoring?" What is that?</p> <p>10 A. BIS is bispectral index. It's a measure of 11 hypnotic depth.</p> <p>12 Q. And then number two, "Is intraoperative 13 forced-air used and, if so, what kind of cover?" See 14 that?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. And then Martin Grady or Dr. Grady 17 wrote you back, then, on April 16th, correct, --</p> <p>18 A. Apparently.</p> <p>19 Q. -- of 2009, and he wrote, "No forced air 20 warming device is currently used. I think it would be 21 a tough sell with the surgeons (surgical field 22 concerns)." Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And then you wrote him back and copied Al 25 Van Duren, Gary Hansen and Gary Maharaj, then at</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 137	Page 139
<p>1 Arizant; correct?</p> <p>2 A. Apparently.</p> <p>3 Q. And Al Van Duren forwards that on to Mark</p> <p>4 Scott and John Rock on that -- few days later;</p> <p>5 correct?</p> <p>6 A. Apparently.</p> <p>7 Q. And says, "Note Dr. Grady's reason that Bair</p> <p>8 Hugger is not used at Hillcrest (Cleveland Clinic)."</p> <p>9 So in fact you were aware that one of the</p> <p>10 reasons that physicians at Cleveland Clinic wasn't</p> <p>11 using the Bair Hugger was because of surgical field</p> <p>12 concerns, correct, --</p> <p>13 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>14 question --</p> <p>15 Q. -- as reflected in this document?</p> <p>16 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>17 question, lack -- also lacks foundation.</p> <p>18 A. Actually, first, this is cardiac only.</p> <p>19 There's no indication for using forced-air warming</p> <p>20 during cardiac surgery because the bypass pump</p> <p>21 transfers a hundred times as much heat as forced air.</p> <p>22 I didn't want them to use forced air because</p> <p>23 forced air might warm the air around the forehead and</p> <p>24 interfere with the Spot On validations we were doing.</p> <p>25 The surgical-field concerns does not refer</p>	<p>1 about this following his e-mail to you on April 16th;</p> <p>2 correct?</p> <p>3 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>4 question.</p> <p>5 A. You can read anything you want into it, but</p> <p>6 that's not what this is about.</p> <p>7 Q. I guess my question is a little different.</p> <p>8 You didn't talk with him about this statement at any</p> <p>9 point in time; correct?</p> <p>10 A. No. Why would I? He says they don't use</p> <p>11 forced air and I didn't want them to use forced air.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Now have you done, as part of your</p> <p>13 Outcomes --</p> <p>14 What's the name of, I'm sorry, your --</p> <p>15 A. Outcomes Research Consortium.</p> <p>16 Q. Outcomes -- Outcomes Research Consortium.</p> <p>17 Have you made presentations regarding</p> <p>18 PerfecTemp?</p> <p>19 A. Well I imagine a study was presented at some</p> <p>20 point.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. Do you know whether in a PowerPoint</p> <p>22 you mentioned that one of the advantages to the</p> <p>23 PerfecTemp is that it doesn't blow air around?</p> <p>24 A. I certainly never presented that.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. If your department did, would you</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Page 138</p> <p>1 to infection; this is just simply who gets what</p> <p>2 surface area, and the surgeons doing cardiac surgery</p> <p>3 want to go right up to the neck because they split the</p> <p>4 sternum starting about here (indicating).</p> <p>5 Q. Well he doesn't say that. He says, "I think</p> <p>6 it would be a tough sell with the surgeons" because of</p> <p>7 surgical field concerns; correct?</p> <p>8 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the</p> <p>9 question.</p> <p>10 Q. Did you have a conversation with him</p> <p>11 following this e-mail about what he meant when he</p> <p>12 said, "No forced air warming is currently used. I</p> <p>13 think it would be a tough sell with surgeons (surgical</p> <p>14 field concerns)"?</p> <p>15 A. No, I didn't. I -- I didn't want forced air</p> <p>16 to be used. Martin's opinion about forced-air warming</p> <p>17 is just irrelevant to me; he's not an expert in the</p> <p>18 subject. That the surgeons want to have access to a</p> <p>19 certain amount of surface area is perfectly</p> <p>20 reasonable, it's a surgical decision. Ultimately,</p> <p>21 anesthesia is there to help surgeons get on with their</p> <p>22 job. This -- this has nothing to do with infection or</p> <p>23 danger or anything else.</p> <p>24 Q. Well you don't know that because you just</p> <p>25 said that you never had any conversation with him</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 140</p> <p>1 take issue with it?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay.</p> <p>4 A. But -- but it wouldn't surprise me that it</p> <p>5 happened. I don't control everything that happens</p> <p>6 in -- in my department or the consortium.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. But you are chair.</p> <p>8 A. I'm a chair, but I don't control everything</p> <p>9 that happens. I'm not that kind of chair.</p> <p>10 Q. If somebody in your group wrote that one of</p> <p>11 the advantages of the PerfecTemp -- PerfecTemp is</p> <p>12 because it doesn't blow air around, there's no chance</p> <p>13 of potential increase of contamination, would you take</p> <p>14 issue with that?</p> <p>15 A. I would indeed.</p> <p>16 Q. Well you'd agree with me that the PerfecTemp</p> <p>17 doesn't blow air around; right?</p> <p>18 A. It does not.</p> <p>19 Q. Who -- who in the department would give a</p> <p>20 presentation on the protocol for the PerfecTemp study?</p> <p>21 A. Could be anybody, but most likely it was one</p> <p>22 of the students involved in the study.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you have anybody that you can think of</p> <p>24 off the top of your head? Do you know which students</p> <p>25 were involved in the --</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 141	Page 143
<p>1 A. In PerfecTemp?</p> <p>2 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>3 A. Absolutely not.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. Well you published on it, though;</p> <p>5 right? You published on -- a study on it. Did you</p> <p>6 work with anyone in your department on that study?</p> <p>7 A. Well certainly the co-authors of the study</p> <p>8 were involved.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. But --</p> <p>10 A. There may have been other people also.</p> <p>11 Q. But did you have somebody that -- within</p> <p>12 your group that was assisting you with that?</p> <p>13 A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Our</p> <p>14 studies are collaborative efforts and lots of people</p> <p>15 contribute in different ways to a study, so yes,</p> <p>16 everybody assisted with it.</p> <p>17 Q. My question might have been poor.</p> <p>18 So there were more than one person within</p> <p>19 your group that worked on that PerfecTemp study?</p> <p>20 A. Well it was at least all the co-authors.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And those are --</p> <p>22 So were those colleagues, the co-authors?</p> <p>23 A. I -- I believe so. But we can pull up</p> <p>24 the --</p> <p>25 Q. Yeah. Would you pull it up? I'm sorry to</p>	<p>1 (Exhibit 232 was marked for</p> <p>2 identification.)</p> <p>3 BY MS. CONLIN:</p> <p>4 Q. I've handed you what's been marked, Dr.</p> <p>5 Sessler, a two-page document bearing Bates page 585482</p> <p>6 through 83, which is a series of e-mails, it looks</p> <p>7 like, between various individuals at Arizant.</p> <p>8 A. Okay.</p> <p>9 Q. Have you had a chance to review it?</p> <p>10 A. I have.</p> <p>11 Q. Does this refresh your recollection that you</p> <p>12 in 2006 were working with Arizant on an underbody --</p> <p>13 underbody blanket study?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. And that the conclusion was that</p> <p>16 there was no significant treatment effect associated</p> <p>17 with the use of underbody blankets?</p> <p>18 A. Correct.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And did they talk with you about not</p> <p>20 publishing the results as initially reported to them?</p> <p>21 A. Not that I remember.</p> <p>22 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, what's been</p> <p>23 marked as Deposition Exhibit 85, which is an e-mail</p> <p>24 from you to Al Van Duren and others at Arizant dated</p> <p>25 January 24th, 2007. Bottom e-mail reads, "Good</p>
<p>1 ask that.</p> <p>2 A. I'll tell you exactly who they are.</p> <p>3 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>4 A. Okay. So if I can do this without making</p> <p>5 too much of a mess here --</p> <p>6 Okay. The co-authors were Cameron Egan,</p> <p>7 Ethan Bernstein, Designen Reddy, Madi Ali, James Paul,</p> <p>8 Dongsheng Yang, and me.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And so those are all within your</p> <p>10 department.</p> <p>11 A. No.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Which ones are in your department?</p> <p>13 A. Well it's -- it's coded there. You can</p> <p>14 simply look at the superscripts and then look down on</p> <p>15 the bottom left and it tells you exactly --</p> <p>16 Q. So Cameron -- Cameron --</p> <p>17 A. Cam -- Cameron and Ethan and Dongsheng are</p> <p>18 from my department, and the other three are from the</p> <p>19 Department of Anesthesia at Hamilton General Hospital.</p> <p>20 Q. Now you also did, back in 2007, you did --</p> <p>21 did an underbody blanket study for Arizant; is that</p> <p>22 right?</p> <p>23 A. I don't know what you're referring to. I'm</p> <p>24 sorry.</p> <p>25 Q. Sure.</p>	<p>1 morning, Dan,</p> <p>2 "Thanks for your cooperation. Just be</p> <p>3 clear, I understand that you will not submit this</p> <p>4 paper for publication until we have had time to study</p> <p>5 it further." Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A. I do.</p> <p>7 Q. Then you write them back and you say,</p> <p>8 "Understood! We regard this as a collaborative effort</p> <p>9 to put the best face on a disappointing clinical</p> <p>10 result. Rather than a 'response,' you can make</p> <p>11 suggestions and necessary changes right in the text of</p> <p>12 the manuscript." Do you see that?</p> <p>13 A. Yeah.</p> <p>14 Q. And that in fact was an attempt, in</p> <p>15 connection with the underbody study, to put the best</p> <p>16 face on a disappointing clinical result; is that</p> <p>17 right?</p> <p>18 A. We were trying to understand what the result</p> <p>19 means. The -- the difficulty with that result is that</p> <p>20 it was inconsistent with probably dozens of previous</p> <p>21 studies. There -- there's no chance whatsoever that</p> <p>22 forced air suddenly stopped working in a general</p> <p>23 sense, we know forced air warms, so there was</p> <p>24 something special about that study that led to failure</p> <p>25 then, and what I'm trying to do is understand what</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 145	Page 147
<p>1 that special thing is so that we know so we can 2 interpret it. Clear -- clearly, the results of the 3 study are that under those circumstances you shouldn't 4 use forced air, it doesn't help, but it's -- that 5 doesn't mean it doesn't work in other circumstances. 6 It clearly does.</p> <p>7 Q. Right. And you reported to the individuals 8 at Arizant that you viewed it as a collaborative 9 effort to put the best face on a disappointing 10 clinical result; correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yup.</p> <p>12 (Exhibit 233 was marked for 13 identification.)</p> <p>14 BY MS. CONLIN:</p> <p>15 Q. And in fact, you edited that paper in order 16 to put the best face on a disappointing clinical 17 result; correct, Dr. Sessler?</p> <p>18 A. I don't know. I don't remember what I did.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. I've handed you what has been marked 20 as Deposition Exhibit 233, a one-page document bearing 21 Bates 518536, which is an e-mail from Gary Hansen to 22 Al Van Duren and others at Arizant dated May 8th, 23 2007. Subject line is "Sessler Updated Paper." Do 24 you see that?</p> <p>25 A. Yup.</p>	<p>1 Q. Well in this case they asked you not to 2 publish it and you agreed; correct?</p> <p>3 A. No, that's not what they asked.</p> <p>4 Q. Well the original -- the original version of 5 it --</p> <p>6 A. No. No, they didn't.</p> <p>7 Q. -- they asked you not to publish.</p> <p>8 A. No, they didn't. Read it.</p> <p>9 Q. "Just be clear, I understand that you will 10 not submit this paper for publication until we've had 11 time to study it further."</p> <p>12 A. "...until we've had time to study it 13 further."</p> <p>14 Q. Okay.</p> <p>15 A. And that's written into the contract. I 16 don't even have a choice about that.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. But then they --</p> <p>18 You agreed to that, and then they came back 19 and --</p> <p>20 A. I have to agree to it, it's a con -- 21 contractual obligation.</p> <p>22 Q. And then they came back to you and basically 23 they report -- report that Sessler did what we asked 24 of him and it's now a much more favorable paper; 25 right?</p>
<p>1 Q. And then Gary writes to Al, "Teri is OK with 2 the latest version. I haven't heard back from anyone 3 else, but basically Sessler did what we asked of him. 4 It's now a much more favorable paper." Do you see 5 that?</p> <p>6 A. I do.</p> <p>7 Q. This suggests to me that you would -- you 8 were working with 3M, at least in connection with this 9 underbody blanket, to put the best face on a 10 disappointing outcome, and you took direction from 3M 11 as to how to do that. Is that a fair reading of these 12 e-mails?</p> <p>13 MR. GORDON: Object to the form of the 14 question.</p> <p>15 A. No. Took suggestions.</p> <p>16 Q. Well --</p> <p>17 A. Virtually every contract we have with a 18 company to do a study includes that they get to review 19 the manuscript and make suggestions. They can't 20 prevent publication; we -- we publish everything. And 21 they don't control what's in the -- in the paper, but 22 they are welcome to make suggestions. Many of these 23 people are content experts in their own right. And I 24 take suggestions seriously; I don't necessarily accept 25 them.</p>	<p>1 A. That's what it says.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And then it says, "Unless anyone else 3 has an opinion, I would tell him to go ahead." Does 4 that mean and publish it?</p> <p>5 MS. DIFRANCO: You're asking him what Gary 6 meant -- what Gary meant when he said that?</p> <p>7 MS. CONLIN: Yeah, it's a -- actually, 8 that's a fair objection.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you know that after -- whether after, 10 following this series of e-mails, that you did go 11 ahead and publish the underbody study?</p> <p>12 A. It was published.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. Do you have a contract with 3M 14 regarding your work?</p> <p>15 A. There's a contract for each study.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. I don't know if we've seen those or 17 not, but do they outline what you can publish and when 18 you can publish in connection with a study?</p> <p>19 A. The clinic will never sign a contract 20 forbidding publication, but almost all of them include 21 the right to review and have a reasonable amount of 22 time to make suggestions. That -- that's just normal.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And it would make sense that you 24 would have, at the end of the day, the ultimate right 25 whether to choose to publish something or not.</p>

CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Page 149	Page 151
<p>1 A. I absolutely have the ultimate right. 2 And -- and we publishing everything whether it's 3 favorable or not. It was never on the table to not 4 publish this, the only question was how to interpret 5 it most accurately.</p> <p>6 Q. Or most favorably; correct?</p> <p>7 A. Most -- most accurately.</p> <p>8 Q. Well it was to put the best face on a 9 disappointing clinical result; correct?</p> <p>10 A. Make sense of it.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And in connection with that 2011 12 Sessler/Olmstead/Kuelpmann study, did you have a 13 contract on that?</p> <p>14 A. No, we didn't, because it was not -- 15 They didn't pay me for that.</p> <p>16 Q. It was because you did a favor, as we saw in 17 the e-mails; correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 MS. CONLIN: Okay. I don't think I have any 20 further questions.</p> <p>21 MR. GORDON: Take a break. I'm not sure if 22 I do have any questions, but I'll review a couple 23 things.</p> <p>24 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please. 25 (Discussion off the record.)</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. But as you sit here today, you don't 2 know of anything that you said in those transcripts 3 that are not accurate today.</p> <p>4 A. That's correct.</p> <p>5 MS. CONLIN: Thank you. I have no further 6 questions.</p> <p>7 THE REPORTER: Off the record, please. 8 (Recess taken.) 9 (Mr. Gordon indicated off the record that he 10 had no questions, and Ms. DiFranco waived 11 signature.) 12 (Deposition concluded.)</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>
<p>1 MS. CONLIN: I didn't bring copies of the 2 depositions for everyone because I'm not going into 3 them, I just want to mark them as exhibits. I have 4 two copies. If you can mark that.</p> <p>5 MR. GOSS: These were the prior depositions?</p> <p>6 MS. CONLIN: Yeah. I just want to mark them 7 as exhibits. You can mark that. Mark this. 8 (Discussion off the stenographic record.) 9 (Exhibits 234 through 236 were marked for 10 identification.)</p> <p>11 BY MS. CONLIN:</p> <p>12 Q. I've handed you, Dr. Sessler, copies of the 13 deposition transcripts of your prior testimony in the 14 Texas litigation that I mentioned earlier today, and 15 my only question for you is: You gave what you 16 believe to be truthful and accurate answers at the 17 time you were deposed as reflected in Exhibits 234, 18 235 and 236?</p> <p>19 A. I have not read these.</p> <p>20 Q. Yeah. But I mean as you sit there today, I 21 mean you would stand --</p> <p>22 A. I believe what I said previously was 23 accurate, best of my abilities at the time, but I have 24 not reviewed the transcripts. I -- I cannot attest to 25 their accuracy.</p>	<p>1 C E R T I F I C A T E 2 I, Richard G. Stirewalt, hereby certify that 3 I am qualified as a verbatim shorthand reporter, that 4 I took in stenographic shorthand the deposition of DR. 5 DANIEL SESSLER at the time and place aforesaid, and 6 that the foregoing transcript is a true and correct, 7 full and complete transcription of said shorthand 8 notes, to the best of my ability. 9 Dated at Deerwood, Minnesota, this 15th day 10 of January, 2017.</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17 RICHARD G. STIREWALT 18 Registered Professional Reporter 19 Notary Public</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>